CATHOLIC
OOKSELL
Boston.

Holy Cross College
Library

Worcester,
Massachusetts

THIS BOOK IS NO LONGER THE
PROPERTY OF THE HOLY CROSS LIBRARY
Date

ALMA COLLEGE
LIBRARY
Alma, California

Alma, California

IHS

THIS BOOK IS NO LONGER THE
PROPERTY OF THE HOLY CROSS LIBRARY

Date ______ Signed ______

OK

ESSAYS ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS.

VOL. I.

ESSAYS

ON

VARIOUS SUBJECTS.

BY HIS EMINENCE,

CARDINAL WISEMAN.

IN SIX VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

NEW YORK:
P. O'SHEA, 27 BARCLAY STREET.
1873.

ALMA COLLEGE LIBRARY Alma, California

Property of
CLgA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

ALMA COLLEGE 208.9 LIBRARY W755 Alma, California

~~4981~~

8945

CONTENTS.

VOL. I.

PAGE

PREFACE........ v

Two Letters on some parts of the Controversy concerning the Genuineness of 1 *John v.* 7 *(with Plate)*........ 1

Catholic Versions of Scripture........ 83

The Parables of the New Testament........ 119

The Miracles of the New Testament........ 194

The Actions of the New Testament........ 288

PREFACE.

If I owe any apology to my readers for publishing this series of unconnected papers and essays, I must be content to plead the request of many friends, and frequent applications from strangers, to have such a collection made. For, although much of what is now printed with my name originally appeared anonymously, and under the shelter of editorial responsibility, its authorship has been pretty generally known, and never disavowed. This is not uncommon in reviews; and yet there is a convenience in the advantages of such a position; for it enables the writer to speak with a confidence, and sometimes with a boldness, from which he would shrink, if he spoke in his own person, and not as the representative of certain principles, embodied in a collective responsibility.

The greater part, in fact, of the essays now presented to the public, have appeared as papers in the *Dublin Review;* and they preserve in this collection their primitive form. This has been done, not merely to escape the trouble of changing the plural into the singular number, but because I feel that the plural preserves a modesty of tone, and a reserve of opinion, which was originally intended, and would be lost by any change of forms. For, as I have intimated, the *Dublin Review* is the exponent of a system of views, to which, rather than to individual speculations, each contributor's writings should be referred.

It was in 1836 that the idea of commencing a Catholic quarterly was first conceived by the late learned and excellent Mr. Quin, who applied to the illustrious O'Connell and myself to join in the undertaking. I was in England only for a short time, and saw the difficulty of connecting myself with an enterprise so far removed from my permanent residence in Rome. Still, I saw the importance of such an organ of Catholic principles and sentiments, and gladly consented to become a member of this little association. The first number appeared in May 1836, before I left this country. The two gentlemen with whom I was associated were laymen: the one living in the very whirlpool of existing politics, the other a man of letters, with a prospect, I believe, of receiving an important foreign employment from Government; both were sincerely attached to their faith and Church. I considered myself as associated to represent the theological and religious elements in the journal, and to secure to its pages soundness of doctrine. It was understood to be a condition of this association that no extreme political views should be introduced into the *Review;* and this condition has, in most trying times, been faithfully observed.

A few years of separation virtually, and afterwards death most really, sundered this bond; and I find myself the only survivor of those who began an undertaking that has grown to some magnitude —looking back through thirty-three volumes, or sixty-seven numbers, of a periodical work, undertaken for a great purpose, and having to account for my share of responsibility in it, and answer whether I have remained faithful to its first principles, and steady to its object.

While obeying the suggestions of others, by preparing the present publication, I have had ample opportunity of examining this question; and I trust I may be indulged if I make such observations upon it as may throw light upon the collection of papers here reprinted.

The moment when I was invited to join in this new review appeared to me most critical and interesting. Three years before, had begun to manifest themselves the germs of that wonderful movement which, originating at Oxford, was destined to pervade and agitate the Anglican Establishment, till it should give up many of its most loving and gifted sons to the Catholic Church; peculiar circumstances, allusion to which will be found in a note* in vol. ii. pp. 93 and 102, had made me at Rome previously acquainted with the rise and progress of this great religious revolution; and I have been surprised, on visiting England in 1835, to find how little attention it had yet excited among Catholics, though many *Tracts for the Times* had already appeared, and Dr. Whateley had sung out to their writers, "Tendimus in Latium." It was, indeed, impossible for any one to foresee what might be the final results of so new and strange a commotion in the hitherto stagnant element of the

* This note will be found in the 4th volume of this Ed.

State-religion. Even now, after twenty years, and notwithstanding the many great consequences which have already issued from it, its activity is not exhausted. The impulse given by the first *Tract* still urges on the body which it struck; and it will roll forward for a long time to come, while fragments detach themselves, and run before it, towards the goal which we pray it may all attain. But even in that first bud of the rising power, it was impossible for a calm and hopeful eye not to see new signs in the religious firmament, which it became a duty to observe, unless one wished to incur the Divine reproach, addressed to those who note not the providential warnings and friendly omens of the spiritual heavens. For Catholics to have overlooked all this, and allowed the wonderful phenomenon to pass by, not turned to any useful purpose, but gazed at till it died out, would have been more than stupidity,—it would have been wickedness. To watch its progress, to observe its phases, to influence, if possible, its direction, to move it gently towards complete attainment of its unconscious aims; and, moreover, to protest against its errors, to warn against its dangers, to provide arguments against its new modes of attack, and to keep lifted up the mask of beauty under which it had, in sincerity, covered the ghastly and soulless features of Protestantism; these were the duties which the new Review undertook to perform, or which, in no small degree, it was expressly created to discharge. And the necessity of attending to these new duties formed the strongest inducement to myself to undertake its theological direction.

At the same time, Catholics had begun to recover from that first torpor, which benumbs, for a time, the limbs just freed from fetters. Signs of a more active circulation had shown themselves: communities were springing up; schools were beginning to be multiplied ; new missions were opened; churches, upon a scale of size and of embellishment previously unknown, were contemplated or begun; and the people were evidently manifesting more interest in our religion, and a more fair disposition to hear and judge it justly. It seemed the favorable moment to strike another chord, and stir up a spirit yet slumbering, but ready to awake. The Catholic religion, as she is in the fulness of her growth, with the grandeur of her ritual, the beauty of her devotions, the variety of her institutions, required to be made more known to many who had never seen her other than she had been reduced by three hundred years of barbarous persecution.

Nothing could so adequately seize on these two great objects, and securely promote them, as a quarterly periodical. The length of articles which it would admit would give it power to discuss any topic in sufficient extent, beyond that of a newspaper or magazine ; while it would be able to return again and again to the same subject, follow its course and developments, keep it before the public mind, and work out its applications—advantages which a work, once written and complete, could not possibly possess.

For any one feeling a deep interest in promoting these two purposes, holding it for a matter of duty to devote himself, if in his power, to their success;

and conscious that earnestness, hopefulness, and much consideration of their details, and some experience in them, gave him some advantage,—for any one so feeling to have refused participation in the proposed work, from fear of presumption, would have been a weakness, almost a baseness. It was therefore with a strong desire, and a sincere determination, to make the *Dublin Review* the organ and the promoter of Catholic progress, within and without; it was with a conscientious resolution that its theology should belong to the present day,—that is, should treat of living questions and existing controversies, should grapple with real antagonists, wrestle with tangible errors, that I agreed to turn from studies long pursued and ardently cherished, to the anxious care and desultory occupation involved in the direction of such a publication. Works not only long contemplated, but for which materials had been gathered with diligence, were given up at this period, in consequence of time and attention being more required for passing events and current literature.

At the same time, it was necessary to mingle with these pursuits others of a less severe character, though generally of a religious tendency. Our religion is attacked in every possible way—in books of travel, in works on history, in fictitious stories. To such assaults it was necessary to pay attention; in a style, however, more proportioned to the matter and character of the writers reviewed.

According, therefore to this triple distribution of subjects, this collection has been formed. The first volume contains papers chiefly supposing Catholic readers. It begins with scriptural essays, to complete a series, whereof it has been found necessary to add one, in an appendix to the third volume, from a later number of the *Review*, than those which have furnished materials for the present work. It closes with papers intended to bring out the beauties of the Catholic ritual, of Catholic practices, and of Catholic devotions.

The second* volume, with the exception of its last article, is exclusively occupied with the High-church question, or what used to be called, the Oxford controversy. In the very first number of the *Review* appeared the first paper on this subject; and this was kept steadily in view through the succeeding volumes, till it might be said to be fairly closed. But on this subject I will take the liberty of saying a few words in a special preface to that volume.

Finally, the third† volume is made up of papers and essays of a more miscellaneous character—historical, artistical, archæological, and controversial. Less unity of purpose or continuity of thought will naturally be here expected. And if, in this republication, a considerable number of former writings have been omitted, it has been chiefly because they have lost an interest which passing circumstances gave them, or they were deemed even less worthy than what has been selected, to be snatched from their repose in the volumes of the *Review*. For I feel it a duty, rather than a satisfaction, to say, that on looking over this collection of papers, stretching over a period of seventeen years, covering that critical period of life which comprises the

* Vols. 3 and 4 of this Ed. † Vols. 5 and 6 of this Ed.

maturity of youthful vigor, and the commencement of intellectual decline,—the age of bold thoughts, and that of cautious emendations,—I have not found an opinion or a feeling that I have ceased to entertain. What was but hope may have ripened into fulfilment—but I see no reason to regret that I hoped: what was implored may have since been granted—but I have no cause to grieve that I entreated: what was a suggestion may have grown into a reality—but I cannot be sorry that the suggestion was made. Things and persons and circumstances may have changed much, so that one cannot, and must not, feel now as then: but it is a consolation to have still the conviction that one did feel right then, because those feelings were the necessary germs of what we know to be right now.

To express this, I have said is a duty: and this may require some explanation. I will give it, on the Oxford question in my second preface: I must give it briefly here, on the other portions of this collection. Were it hinted that such consistency of sentiment was to be attributed to firmness of character, or depth of previous reflection, or early maturity of judgment, in the writer, it would be merely a boast, as misplaced as it would be false. Only a principle could stand the test of so many years; and in religious ideas only one principle can remain unchangeable. It is to render homage to this truth that I consider it a duty. Looking back over this long term of years, remembering how one fixed determination formed my whole stock of principles for theory and practice, and seeing how faithfully it has supplied the want of much learning, the absence of brilliant gifts, the dearth of popular topics, and deficiency in popular arts, I have surely a right to prize it above all these advantages, and consider it as a part of that heavenly wisdom which God refuses to none in his Church. And this was the determination to keep strictly under her guidance, to prize her orthodox teaching beyond all seductive theories, all brilliant paradoxes, all palliating explanations; to love Catholic truth, simple and unmodified as found at its centre, as practised by artless believers; to look there for purity of doctrine and accuracy of observance, where God has left the richest deposit for the future resurrection, in the ashes of His Apostles. This unbounded devotion to Christ's one Church, this undeviating adherence to her supreme Ruler, has been the chart and compass by which I have endeavored to sail; and, while I humbly trust that not a word will be found in these volumes discordant with her teaching, her maxims, her desires, her thoughts, I submit to her correction all that is here written, and beg every obscurity or dubiousness to be interpreted on this principle.

To this one elementary principle, which a child may have as easily as a man, I exclusively attribute any good results which may have flowed from these essays; I cannot indeed, without ingratitude, reject the consolations received from effects attributed to them; for I fear that my readers will wonder sometimes at finding wants mentioned now so well supplied, and feelings suggested long become so familiar, that the very memory of our deficiencies has faded away. More than half a generation has passed by since those passages were written, which now describe an unknown state of things. And if their words had some influence in producing the change, their power lay in this alone—that they were sincere, cordial, and affectionate descriptions of realities often witnessed by the writer, deeply admired, and tenderly loved; they were words of truth and of charity, which ever bear with them their own evidences and convictions, straight to the minds of all.

That the many imperfections of so miscellaneous a collection may be elaborately investigated and severely handled, I am fully prepared to expect. I have long ceased to anticipate fair dealing from those who look upon me as an enemy, and think it their duty to treat me as such. Custom, however, inures us to this; and I trust that I shall have patience to bear it to the end. And nothing helps one more to this than a consciousness that no bitterness of thought, or personal rancor or desire to wound, has guided one's own pen or intentions. Should any words of mine suggest a different impression, I shall sincerely regret it.

With these words of peace, I take leave of my courteous reader; wishing him, from above, all grace and blessing, as I bid him to implore for me all mercy and forgiveness.

EASTER, MDCCCLIII.

TWO LETTERS

ON

SOME PARTS OF THE CONTROVERSY

CONCERNING THE

GENUINENESS OF 1 JOHN v. 7.

"And there are Three who give testimony in Heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these Three are One."

Containing also an Inquiry into the Origin of the First Latin Version of Scripture, commonly called "THE ITALA."

THE two following letters were first published in the "*Catholic Magazine*," in 1832–3. They were republished in Rome in 1835, with some additions. The author was led into the discussion which they contain, by a correspondence in which he had been engaged with the late Dr. Burgess, bishop of St. David's, respecting MSS. which contain 1 John v. 7.

The discussion of the country of the first Latin version of Scripture, though incidental to the original inquiry, may be said to become the primary subject of these letters. These letters suppose the reader to be acquainted with the outline of the controversy upon the text in question. Its genuineness was impugned in the last century by English and German critics; and these essays pretend to nothing more than the collection of additional evidence in its favor, from the authority of Latin MSS. This will account for the abrupt rush, at once, into the subject; and for the absence of any popular explanations of terms. In fact, they were intended more to be materials for scholars to consider, than finished dissertations on the controversies, and, with few verbal changes, they are left in the same form.

TWO LETTERS

ON

I. JOHN v. 7,

COMMONLY CALLED THE THREE WITNESSES.

LETTER THE FIRST.

To the Editor of the "Catholic Magazine."

Dear Sir,—A periodical like yours is the most appropriate channel of information upon such points of sacred literature as, from their partial and detached nature, may not deserve a separate publication. Hence I shall make no apology to you, or your readers, for transmitting to you a few remarks upon some parts of the important controversy regarding the celebrated verse, 1 John v. 7; though they will be rather thrown together in the form of loose notes than arranged as a complete dissertation. Indeed, I foresee, at the outset, that my letters will be extremely desultory, and that I shall probably be led to give my humble opinion upon several points not immediately connected with the principal object of my inquiries.

Perhaps the strongest portion of the evidence in favor of this long-controverted passage consists in the authority of Latin testimonies, the Vulgate, and the Latin Fathers. The adversaries of the verse have been compelled to acknowledge that the majority of Latin manuscripts contain it; but have, in reply, contended that it is wanting in the most ancient. Dr. Porson insists upon this argument in the following terms: "To which side shall we give credit, to age or to numbers? On the one side, the witnesses are grave, elderly persons, who lived nearer the time when the fact happened which they assert, and they are all consistent in their testimony, while the other party, vastly superior in numbers, yet lived too late to be competently acquainted with the cause."* And what is the respective antiquity attributed by this learned writer to each class of testimonies? From his observations upon the two Harleian MSS., he seems to consider the verse as not existing in any Latin manuscript anterior to the *tenth* century: for he says: "In the Harleian catalogue, No. 7,551 contains three copies of the first Epistle of St. John. The first copy seems to be of the tenth century, the second of the ninth, and both omit the heavenly witnesses."† On the other hand, the oldest manuscript which he mentions, as wanting the verse, is the celebrated Lectionary published by Mabillon, held to be about

---

* Letters to Mr. Archdeacon Travis, in answer to his defence of the three heavenly witnesses. *Lond.* 1790, p. 154.

† Page 152.

1,200 years old, or of the seventh century.* With the dates thus fixed by Porson, the sentiments of Griesbach appear to coincide. These are his words: "Codices Latini ante sæculum *nonum* scripti versum septimum plane non habent a prima manu. . . Invenitur in nonnullis sæculo *decimo* exaratis; fortasse etiam (a prima manu) in uno et altero sæc. nono scripto, siquidem de eorum ætate recte judicarunt, qui eos tractaverunt."†

Mr. Horne, in treating this subject, commits a singular oversight, easily accounted for in a compiler not always careful to reconcile together the jarring passages he has collected from different writers. He says: "The passage does not appear in any (Latin) manuscripts *written before the tenth century.*" After a few lines, in the same page and paragraph, he proceeds to say: "*After the eighth century, the insertion becomes general.* For manuscripts written after that period have generally, though not always, the passage in the body of the text."‡ The Latin manuscripts of the period intervening between these two dates, or written in the ninth century, must be exceedingly curious documents. Do they contain or omit the verse? If they contain it, his first assertion is incorrect; if they omit it, his second.

---

* Page 153.

† Nov. Testam. ed. *Lond.* 1818, vol. ii. p. 640.

‡ Introduction to the critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures. 6th ed. *Lond.* 1828, vol. iv. p. 468.

It is obviously a matter of the greatest importance that all accessible evidence upon this important question should be laid before the public, and my principal object in now addressing you is to communicate observations upon two Latin manuscripts, of a date anterior to any hitherto attributed to those containing the verse, by the opposers of its genuineness; which, however, will be shown to contain it.

The first document to which I beg to call the attention of critics is a beautiful manuscript of the Vulgate, preserved in the venerable Benedictine monastery of La Cava, situated between Naples and Salerno. The archives of this ancient house contain upwards of 30,000 parchment rolls, commencing at a very early period; the library also possesses several valuable manuscripts. One of these is the Vulgate alluded to; and when visiting that part of Italy some years ago, I turned aside to the monastery, chiefly for the purpose of inspecting it. I have, however, found still more favorable opportunity to study its text; for the indefatigable librarian of the Vatican, Monsignor Mai,* considered this MS. of sufficient value to deserve an exact transcription. This was ordered by Pope Leo XII., and in the course of last summer (1831), the last sheets were deposited in the Vatican Library by Father Rossi, the archivist of La Cava. It will be difficult, at a distance, to estimate the accuracy and trouble with which this transcript has been effected. It contains the Old and New Testaments, copied line for line and word for word, with an exact imitation of its painted and ornamental parts. Besides making two such exact copies of the manuscript, the industrious archivist has, in two years, classified the entire archives and drawn up, in eleven columns, a descriptive catalogue of 9,000 documents.

---

* Now Cardinal.

The inspection made of the original manuscript was too hurried to authorize me to draw any conclusions regarding the antiquity to which it may aspire. It is written on a beautiful vellum, in large quarto; each page like the celebrated Vatican MS. (1209), contains three columns. There is no division between the words except by an occasional point. The character is exceedingly minute; the initial letters of paragraphs are somewhat larger and stand out of the lines; the marginal notes are written so small as to require a good lens in order to decipher them. A very detailed description has, however, been published of our manuscript by the Abbé Rozan, who has carefully collected all those characteristics which can have any weight in deciding its age.* The following is the result of his investigation.

Of the thirty-one characteristics noticed by him, *thirteen* are mentioned in the *Traité de Diploma-*

---

* Lettre à M le Bibliothécaire de la Bibliothèque du Roi à Naples. 1822.

tique as decisive of *very high antiquity*; *five* as designating a period *anterior to the ninth century*; *three* as indicative of *at least the eighth*; *four* as decisive of the *seventh at least*; and *four* as characteristic of the *sixth*. The two remaining ones are too vague to be of any use.* It is true that the Abbé Rozan himself suggests some difficulties in the way of attributing an excessive antiquity to this manuscript, grounded principally up on the small size and minuscular form of some of the letters. But he solves these objections by citing examples of similar letters in manuscripts of the fifth century; and it is with extreme surprise that his readers find him concluding that this MS. is only one thousand years old. This conclusion seems, from his expressions, to proceed, not so much from his premises, as from his fear to be thought extravagant in his praise.† Indeed, it may not be out of place to remark that many mistakes may be committed through the idea, too prevalent since the promulgation of the Maurist diplomatic canons, that majuscular letters exclusively were prevalent in the early centuries. Some more current character must have been in ordinary use; and a strong evidence of this is to be found in a most valuable manuscript of St. Hilary, preserved in the Archivium of the Chapter of St. Peter's; at the end of which is a note, in a character as connected and rapid as any modern could be supposed to write, to the following effect: "Contuli in nomine Domini Jesu Christi apud Kasulis constitutus, anno quartodecimo Transamundi regis."* This note was therefore written in the year 509, and consequently the manuscript, whose *recensor* added it, must still be more ancient. Now the forms of the letters in this valuable manuscript resemble much those of the La Cava manuscript; and upon the strength of this similarity the learned and experienced Monsignor Mai has no hesitation in considering the latter as of the seventh century at latest; it may be even more ancient. The antiquity of this document is still further confirmed by the peculiarities of its text, which, however, is that of St. Jerome.

---

* Pp. 136–144.

† Page 148.

I will now proceed to give the portion of the first Epistle of St. John which contains the verse of the three Heavenly Witnesses, commencing at the fourth verse of the fifth chapter, and preserving the exact order and orthography of the words, and its marginal annotations:

* Et arius prae
dicat creaturam

> Quoniam homne quod natum est ex deo
> vincit mundum Fides nr̄ā. Quis est au-
> tem qui vincit mundum nisi qui credit
> quia* Ih̄s̄ filius dei est. hic est qui venit
> per aquam et sanguinem et sp̄m̄ Ih̄s̄
> xp̄s

---

* A fac-simile of the MS. of St. Hilary and of this valuable inscription may be seen in Monsignor Mai's Symmachus. *Rome*, 1823.

Et non in aqua solum sed in aqua et sanguine et sp̄ū.
Spiritus* est qui testificatur. qām Ih̄s̄ est veritas.
Quia tres sunt qui testimonium dant in terra.
Spiritus et aqua et sanguis : et hii tres hunum sunt. in xp̄ō Ih̄ū. Et tres sunt qui testimonium dicunt in caelo. Pater. verbum. et sp̄s̄. et* hii tres hunum sunt. Si testimonium hominum accipimus, etc.

* Si veritas quo modo creatura quum creatura vera esse possit. denique de nullo angelorum legitur quod veritas sit.

* Audiat hoc arius et ceteri.

A few simple observations will close the account of this interesting document.

1. In the fourth verse we have a very remarkable example of the power of that "all-devouring monster *omoioteleuton*," as I think Porson somewhere facetiously calls it. To less experienced readers it may be necessary to mention that, in sacred as in profane criticism, one of the most fertile sources of omission in manuscripts is a similarity of words occurring near to one another. The transcriber's eye is taken from his original at the first passage, and upon returning to it, catches by mistake the same word lower down, and thus the whole intermediate portion is omitted in the transcript. This similarity of termination constitutes what is technically called an *omoioteleuton*. It is generally supposed, by the writers in defence of our verse, that it has been lost in Greek manu-

scripts by a mistake of this sort, in consequence of the passage immediately preceding it ending with the same words. Now, as has just been remarked, our manuscript, in the two first lines above transcribed, affords us an interesting illustration of the facility of such a mistake. Before *Fides nostra* are omitted the words, *et hæc est victoria quæ vincit mundum;* doubtless because the preceding clause ended likewise with *vincit mundum*, so that the copyist's eye was misled. How easily might a similar mistake have been committed at the seventh verse!

2. In this manuscript, the eighth verse comes before the seventh; and Griesbach has, in fact, remarked that this is the case in the most ancient manuscripts. " Antiquiores fere anteponunt comma octavum septimo."*

3. The dogmatical use made of this text in the margin is likewise worthy of very particular attention. The very earnest manner in which every argument for the Divinity of Christ seems urged by the writer of the notes, would almost lead us to suppose that they were written during the Arian controversy. The energetic and pithy annotation, *audiat hoc Arius et ceteri*, demonstrates better than the longest commentary could have done, the force which the writer attributed to our verse, and the total absence from his mind of any doubt of its genuineness. The second note

---

* Ubi sup.

may appear a little obscure, from the omission of the second member of an antithesis. It says that a creature might indeed be said to be *true*, but could not with propriety be called *the truth*.

To conclude, we have here a Latin manuscript which contains the verse, anterior by at least three centuries to the age allowed by its adversaries for its admission into the text: and the document shows, at the same time, the dogmatical use made of the passage.

The second authority to which I wish to call the attention of critics is of still greater interest: it is that, not merely of a scriptural manuscript, but of an ancient author, quoting it for the express purpose of demonstrating the Trinity.

In the library of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, is preserved a manuscript containing two ecclesiastical treatises. The second is the work of St. Cyprian *ad Quirinum*. The first bears no title at the commencement, by the original transcriber, but its termination is as follows: *Explicit liber testimoniorum*. It was this circumstance which probably led to a much later hand's prefixing the title, *De Testimoniis Scripturarum Augustini contra Donatistas et Ydola*. But from the account which St. Augustine himself gives us of the work written by him under that title, this is not the one. In his *Retractationes*, he speaks of his book, *Probationum et Testimoniorum adversus Donatistas* (as confuting those heretics); *sive de Ecclesiasticis, sive de Publicis Gestis*, *sive de Scripturis Canonicis.*[*] There can be no doubt that this is the same work as his diligent biographer Posidious denotes by the title of *De Testimoniis Scripturarum, contra supra scriptos, et Idola.*[†] Now, our work is altogether composed of scriptural quotations only, and is in no way directed to a confutation of the Donatists.

An earlier hand had before given a much more probable title to the treatise, having written on the first page, *Libri de Speculo.* This leads us into an interesting discussion, of great importance towards the object of our researches; have we here the real work of St. Augustine, entitled *Speculum*, or is this title altogether supposititious? I will be as impartial as possible in conducting the inquiry. My order will be as follows: —First, I will give an account of the work as it exists in our manuscript; secondly, I will state the arguments *against* its being the work of St. Augustine; thirdly, I will propose the arguments which seem to suppose him its author. I will afterwards proceed to examine the degree of authority which, in any hypothesis, this document possesses towards proving the genuineness of our verse.

1. The work which we are considering consists of upwards of one hundred heads, including the most important points of Christian belief and

---

[*] Retract. l. ii. cap. 27, tom. i. p. 51, ed. Maur.

[†] Indical. opusculor. Ib. tom. x. p. 284.

practice. Upon each of these subjects all the texts of the Old and New Testaments are given, without a single remark or illustration. In the main the work is nearly the same as was published under the title of St. Augustine's *Speculum*, by Jerome Vignier.* But it differs in one most important particular, that the text used in our manuscript is not the version of St. Jerome in the Old, nor his çorrection in the New Testament, but the old Vulgate found in the quotations of the Fathers, and collected in the great works of Nobilius, Bianchini, and Sabbatier. It in fact supplies many *lacunæ* in the latter invaluable work, and is therefore a precious addition to our stores of sacred criticism. Indeed, the active and intelligent librarian of Santa Croce is preparing the entire work for publication, chiefly with a view to amending and improving our text of the ancient Vulgate.†

The manuscript itself is a quarto, on vellum: the character is uncial and square, resembling in form and size the Latin of the Codex Bezæ or Cambridge MS. of the New Testament. It is, on the whole, beautifully written, and one must be cautious not to judge of it from the specimen given by Bianchini,* whose fac-similes, from not being traced, will be often found incorrect.† There can be no danger in attributing it to the sixth or seventh century. A fac-simile of it is prefixed to this essay.

---

* S. Aur Augustini operum omnium Supplem. *Par.* 1655, tom. i. p. 517.

† I regret to say that the death of this promising Cistercian religious has, for the present, interrupted this undertaking.

To come now to the most important point: this work quotes the text of the Heavenly Witnesses, as a dogmatical proof of the Trinity. In the second chapter, which is entitled, *De Distinctione Personarum*, fol. 19. *ver.* we have the following passage :—*Item Johannis in aepistula . . . Item illic Tres sunt qui testimonium dicunt in caelo Pater,‡ Verbum et Spiritus. et hii tres unum sunt.* I need hardly point out to my readers the coincidence between this manuscript and the one above quoted, in the use of the word *dicunt* instead of *dant.* It is the reading of Idatius Clarus, the oldest ecclesiastical writer who quotes this portion of the text.*

---

* Evangelior. Quadrup. Romæ, 1748, tom. ii. fol. 595, pl. 2, No. 2.

† This is the case with most of the old fac-similes, which were only drawn by the eye. The specimen of the Codex Vatic. made by Zacagni for Grabe, and published by Horne, does the greatest injustice to that beautifully written MS., which bears a much closer resemblance to the Bankesian Homer, published in the first number of the *Museum Philologicum*. Having mentioned this valuable relic of antiquity, I may take the opportunity to state, that in the Vatican collection of papyri, exists a very small fragment of the Iliad, which I would almost venture to say, formed originally part of the same manuscript as Mr. Bankes's.

‡ This word was first written, by mistake, PARTER, but a stroke was afterwards drawn through the first R by the transcriber himself.

2. Is the more ancient title attributed to this work in our manuscript correct, and have we here the genuine *Speculum* of St. Augustine? It must be a matter of the greatest interest, in the history of this text, to ascertain whether it is quoted by this great luminary of the Church; and we will commence by the arguments which appear to be against his being the author of this treatise. Two perfectly distinct works have been published under the title of St Augustine's Speculum. The first was the one already mentioned as edited by Vignier, to which our treatise bears a close resemblance. This was rejected as spurious by the Maurists, who substituted for it another work of a totally different form.† It consists merely of select texts of Scripture, in the order of the sacred Books, beginning with Exodus, but reduced to no heads or distinct subjects. But it has one decided advantage over the other work, and consequently over ours, that it has a preface, which ours has not. Posidius informs us that the Speculum had a preface prefixed to it. I will give his words at length, as I may have occasion to refer to them more than once: "Quique prodesse omnibus volens, et valentibus multa librorum legere et non valentibus,

---

* This name was assumed by Virgilius Tapsensis. Op. ed. Chifflet, p. 306. St. Eucherius is more ancient; but his text is open to much controversy.

† Op. tom. iii. p. i. p. 681.

ex utroque divino Testamento, Vetere et Novo, præmissa præfatione, præcepta divina seu vetita ad vitæ regulam pertinentia excerpsit, atque ex his unum codicem fecit; ut qui vellet legeret, et in eo vel quam obediens Deo inobediensve esset agnosceret, et hoc opus voluit *Speculum* appellari."* St. Augustine's Speculum had therefore prefixed to it a preface; and if the preface given in the Benedictine edition be genuine, then is the entire work genuine also. For the preface concludes with these words: "Ab ipsa igitur lege quæ data est per Moysen, divinorum præceptorum, qualia nos commemoraturos esse promisimus, aggrediamur exordium." The Benedictine editors gave another reason for rejecting Vignier's Speculum and preferring their own: that a work in which the scriptural authorities are reduced to certain heads, seems rather intended to instruct the mind than to form a code of morals. From this opinion I think most will dissent. It is much easier to inspect the scriptural standard upon any point of morality and reduce our conduct to it, by having all that is written upon the subject brought together, than by seeking out the various passages bearing on it that lie dispersed through the sacred volume, mingled with other and heterogeneous materials. Such are the only arguments whereby the Benedictine editors support the preference they gave to their text. The only one which possesses any strength is the circumstance of the preface, mentioned by Posidius.

---

* **Vita Aug. ubi sup. p. 277.**

3. In favor of the genuineness of the S. Croce text, we may draw a very strong argument from the fact that its quotations are all taken from the old Latin version, and not from St. Jerome's. It is well known that St. Augustine was peculiarly adverse to the design formed by his friend, of translating the Scripture from the Hebrew, and that he never approved of his version. "I would indeed rather," thus he writes to him, "that you would translate the canonical Scriptures as they are authorized by the version of the Seventy. For it would be a hard case if your version come to be adopted in many churches; since the Latin and Greek churches would thus be placed at variance."* "I desire to have your version from the Septuagint, that those who decry your useful labors may at length understand that my reason for not wishing your translation from the Hebrew to be read in churches is the fear that by producing something new, at variance with the Septuagint, one may cause great scandal and disturbance among the faithful, whose ears and hearts are accustomed to that version: which moreover has been approved by the Apostles."† In fact, he gives an instance of much scandal having been actually caused by the attempt to introduce the new version into a neighboring church. "When a cer

---

* Ep. lxxi. (ol. x.) Op. tom. ii. p. 160.

† Ep. lxxxiii. (ol. xix.) ib. p. 203

tain brother bishop endeavored to make use of your version in the church over which he presides a passage in Jonas attracted notice, which you have rendered in a manner totally at variance with what had been long familiar to the senses and memories of all, and consecrated by the use of successive ages. Such a tumult arose among the people, especially from the reasoning of the Greeks, who warmly pressed a charge of falsification against you, that the bishop (for it happened in a city) was obliged to appeal to the testimony of the Jews. . . . What was the consequence? Why, that after considerable danger, rather than be abandoned by his flock, he was compelled to reprobate your rendering as false."* With such manifest proof of St. Augustine's attachment to the old version, of his conviction how imprudent, not to say profane, it was to attempt the introduction of the new, of his conscientious persuasion that the testimony of antiquity, the authority of the apostles, the unity of the Church were all compromised by its adoption, in possession too of the fact that in not one of his undisputed writings does he ever quote from any but the old, we cannot for an instant hesitate to conclude that the Speculum published by the Benedictines, and consisting entirely of quotations from the version of St. Jerome, cannot, as it stands, be the genuine production of St. Augustine.

* Ib. p. 161.

The learned editors have indeed attempted to remove this difficulty, by supposing that our Father afterwards overcame his prejudices against the new version, and may have used it, especially in a work intended for the use of the people. They appeal to his quoting this translation in some of his later works, particularly in the fourth book of Christian Doctrine, which he composed towards the close of his life. To this I would reply—first, that his writing especially for the people would be rather an additional reason for preferring the old version. Even in Rome, the ancient version was used by St. Leo in the fifth century, and even in the sixth, St. Gregory used either, indifferently, thus clearly showing the moment of transition from one to the other. Secondly, an inspection of the passage alluded to by the Maurists will be sufficient to convince any reader that St. Augustine deemed an explanation necessary, if on one extraordinary occasion he made use of the new version: and even that he did not suppose all his readers necessarily acquainted with the translation made by "the priest Jerome, a man skilled in the two languages."*

There is still, it is but fair to remark, one way of removing the difficulty, by supposing that a later hand altered the text and remodelled the work upon the version of St. Jerome. We must acknowledge that this might easily have been done: and the existence of two types of our Speculum, the one with the old, and the other, in Vignier's edition, with the new text, proves that persons were found who thought it worth their while to undertake the task. Still, when applied to the Benedictine text, this is only an unsupported hypothesis. We have no proof of their book having ever existed in any but its modern form, and as such it could not possibly be the work of St. Augustine; of the other, we have positive proof that it did consist originally of the text used by that Father.

---

* De Doct. Christ. lib. iv. c. 7, tom. iii. pa. i. p. 71.

There is another argument for the genuineness of our copy, which has been noticed by the scholar engaged in preparing it for publication. He informs me that he has noticed a very marked resemblance between the titles of some of the sections and St. Augustine's mystical interpretation of the corresponding passages. It would not be difficult to give a few instances, as I have also noted some; but it will be more fair and satisfactory to leave in his hands the full development of this important argument.

Before proceeding further in this essay, we encounter a serious difficulty, involving a long and delicate investigation. It may be objected, with great semblance of truth; does not the very existence of the verse of the three witnesses, in this work, prove it spurious? Is it credible that St. Augustine should here quote this verse in proof of the Trinity, and yet totally pass it over in his

Commentary upon St. John's Epistle, and in his works upon the Trinity, where the series of the text, or the expediency of his argument, imperatively called upon him to notice it? To reconcile this apparent contradiction, becomes a part of my task; and let not my reader be startled if we appear to retire to a great distance the better to effect our object; for the artificer must often attach to a very distant point the threads upon which he will gradually raise a compact and durable texture.

Let us assume it to be known to our readers, that St. Augustine is the only ancient writer who mentions any Latin text of the Scriptures under the title of the *Itala.* His words are: "In ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala ceteris præferatur; nam est verborum tenacior, cum perspicuitate sententiæ."* This passage has given rise to one of the most difficult problems in sacred criticism; and it is to the solution of this problem that I propose to address myself. This will be immediately necessary to remove the difficulty just raised. But at the same time it will be, I trust, useful and important for clearing the entire controversy of the Three Witnesses from some important difficulties, for explaining some striking anomalies in the evidences in its favor, and preparing the way for additional proof. Independently of these motives, and of my having at the outset given the reader fair notice of discursive intentions, the hope of loosing a serious and complicated knot in biblical lieterature will be perhaps a sufficient apology for a long digression.

---

* Ib. lib. ii. c. 15, p. 27.

Two hypotheses have been built upon the passage just quoted. The first is, that there existed in the early Western Church one authentic version called "The Itala," which St. Agustine here preferred to all others. This hypothesis has been almost universally received. Acting upon its supposed certainty, Flaminius Nobilius, Bianchini, and Sabbatier, have labored to reconstruct this version indifferently from the quotations of all the Fathers, without regard to country; and most biblical and theological writers have attributed to it an undoubted existence, under the name of the *Vetus Itala*. This appellation may be considered as almost irrevocably sanctioned.

The second hypothesis is partly grounded upon another passage of St. Augustine, where he speaks of a multiplicity of Latin versions being in existence. This passage will be given and discussed just now. The advocates of this system, generally attributed to Mosheim,* but started many years before by Dr. Whitby,† suppose the *Itala* to be only one of the *many* translations in ordinary use, which our Father, for reasons now impenetrable, happened to prefer.

---

* Comment. de Rebus Christian. ante Constant. Helmest. 1753, p. 225.

† Observat. Philolog. Crit. cum Praef. Havercamp. Lugd. Bat. 1733, p. 84.

The difficulties of these two hypotheses are so obvious that some bolder critics have abandoned both, and instead of attempting to explain the text of St. Augustine, have attempted its emendation. Bentley proposed to change *Itala* into *illa*, and *nam* into *quæ*; Ernesti, no mean name in these pursuits, warmly supported his conjecture; but Casley, with some countenance of a single manuscript, ventured to correct them in their turn. This attempt to alter the text of the passage may be now considered destitute of supporters.

I have said that both the hypotheses above quoted are attended with insurmountable difficulties.

1. As to the first, if "Itala" were the name of a version universally adopted in the Western Church, is it possible that this name never should have been recorded in all antiquity, save only in this single passage of St. Augustine? Is it credible that St. Jerome, St. Gregory, St. Isidore, Cassiodorus, Alcuin, and others, who have written concerning the old version, should never have given its name?—that no manuscript containing the ancient text should be found to bear the title? All will acknowledge that this difficulty cannot be satisfactorily removed.

2. And with regard to the second, it may be said almost to rest upon the sole authority of one

very equivocal passage which shall be presently discussed. The collection of various readings made from the Fathers by several writers, for the express purpose of supporting this hypothesis, is far from doing so. The Fathers indeed often differ from one another in their quotations, in a manner to explain which defies all the ingenuity of conjecture. But then, it not unfrequently happens that one Father, in quoting the same passage upon different occasions, differs from himself as widely as he does from the rest: are we therefore to suppose that he was in the habit of using distinct versions upon these various occasions? In fact, there are just as glaring anomalies of this sort to be found in the Greek Fathers; and Christian Bened. Michaelis, in his celebrated controversy with Bengel, has produced as extraordinary instances of unaccountable discrepancy in their various readings, as can be cited from Latin writers.* Yet no one has ever suspected that they had so many independent texts or versions. On the other hand, though numerous examples of such marked diversity may be collected, though it may baffle all critical ingenuity to reconcile the occasional variety of readings adduced to prove a multiplicity of versions, even by recurring to supposed quotation from memory, or accommodation, or forgetfulness, yet I am convinced that a rapid examination of the quotations of the Latin Fathers in general, would satisfy any critic of common experience and discernment, that their agreement in many extraordinary readings can spring only from the use of an identical version, however altered by ordinary causes. But what seems to place this beyond any doubt, is the tone and style which pervade the scriptural quotations of the Fathers. The general rudeness of the phrase, the repeated recurrence of words not in use among classical writers, the consistent degree of approximation to the original, preserved throughout, in short, the uniform moulding of the features of their text, shows that in all it is the same type, the offspring of one country, almost of one man. And if there was in the Church the liberty of translating, inferred by some writers from St. Augustine's text, and the custom of using such various translations, deduced by them from the various readings of the Fathers, can we suppose that the more elegant writers and accomplished scholars would have invariably selected from such a variety a rude and unpolished version? Or are we to suppose that the privilege of making a new version was entirely reserved to less skilful pens? Again, if such a multiplicity of versions were in use, and at the same time, as we have seen from St. Augustine, the introduction of a new word shocked and scandalized the hearers, how could a bishop or priest of one diocese have preached or instructed in another without mischief or confusion? But these arguments will be much strengthened in my second letter.

---

* Tractatio Critica de Variis Lectionibus N. T. caute colligendis et dijudicandis. *Halle*, 1749, p. 20.

But does the text of St. Augustine authorize the conclusions drawn from it by so many able writers, even in our own times? These are his words: "Qui enim Scripturas ex Hebræa lingua in Græcam verterunt, numerari possunt: Latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuique, primis fidei temporibus, in manus venit codex Græcus, et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguæ habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari."* At first sight, the words *interpretari* and *verterunt* seem clearly to express an actual translation. But we must be cautious in pressing such words too much. Among the ancients they are often used in a less rigorous sense, to signify nothing more than a correction or *recension* of a version already existing. I have shown this on another occasion, as far as regards Greek and Syriac writers;† nor will it be difficult to prove as much regarding St. Augustine. For instance, he thus writes to St. Jerome:—"Proinde non parvas Deo gratias agimus de opere tuo, quod Evangelium ex Græco *interpretatus es*."‡ The expression here is precisely the same as occurs in the passage above quoted. Yet it is certain that St. Jerome never translated the New Testament, but only emended it. For his words are: "N.

---

* De Doct. Christ. ubi sup. c. xi. p. 25.

† Horæ Syriacæ. *Rome*, 1828, p. 94.

‡ Epist. lxxi. ut sup. p. 161.

Testamentum Græcæ fidei reddidi auctoritati."* And it is certain that he understands St. Augustine's phrase, *interpretatus es*, only in this limited sense; for his reply to it is as follows:—"Et si me in *emendatione* Novi Testamenti suscipis."† Indeed, St. Augustine himself explains the phrase on another occasion. He thus writes to his friend:—"Ego sane te mallem Græcas potius canonicas nobis *interpretari* Scripturas, quæ LXX interpretum auctoritate perhibentur." Then, after a few lines, he thus explains himself:—"Ac per hoc plurimum profueris, si eam Græcam Scripturam quam LXX operati sunt, *Latinæ veritati reddideris*."‡ The word *vertere* hardly presents any greater difficulty. St. Jerome, in his letter to Sunnias and Fretela, says:—"Ea autem" (the version of the LXX) "quæ habetur in Hexaplis, et quam nos *vertimus*."§ Yet in other places he assures us that he only emended the existing version:—"Septuaginta interpretes . . . quos ante annos plurimos, diligentissime *emendatos* meæ linguæ studiosis dedi."‖ "Septuaginta interpretum editionem et te habere non dubito, et ante annos plurimos diligentissime *emendatam* studiosis tradidi."¶

---

* De Viris illustribus, cap. cxxxv. tom. ii. p. 941, ed. Vallars.; ep. ad Lucin. lxxi. (ol. 28) tom. i. p. 432.

† In Op. S. Aug. ep. lxxv. tom. ii. p. 178.

‡ Ib. p. 180.

§ Ad Sunniam et Fretel. ep. cvi. tom. i. p. 637.

‖ Adv. Rufin. lib ii. tom. p. 518.

¶ Ep. ad Lucin. ubi sup.

Thus it appears that the great and only historical argument for the multiplicity of versions in the Church, proves no more necessarily than a variety of recensions or corrections of the text. Hence the Itala need not be considered as the name of some specific version, in contradistinction to other translations. And we have seen that it cannot be considered as the name of the *one* received version. In addition to these arguments the analogy of other churches suggests that only one version was used in the Western, subject to numerous modifications from accident or design, but remaining, everywhere, in substance the same. The great tendency of these alterations would necessarily be to produce certain great varieties naturally determined by greater geographical divisions, or circumscribed by the limits of different ecclesiastical jurisdictions. These varieties are well known in biblical criticism, under the name of *families* or *recensions.* In the East, the Greek text will occur to the reader as a full illustration of this remark; the Syriac version has followed the same law, and the Catholics, Nestorians, and Jacobites have their respective texts of the Peshito. Not only the Scripture, but any other work frequently transcribed, will naturally present the same phenomenon. Thus M. Gence, in his critical edition of the "Imitation of Christ," has clearly pointed out Flemish, French, and Italian recensions, of which the manuscripts of the Abbey of Moeck, of the Chartreuse of Villeneuve, and of Arona, may be considered as the types, and which embrace numbers of MSS. agreeing essentially among themselves, but exhibiting a line of critical, as well as geographical, circumscription.*

Such, then, would be the case with the Latin version, and the texts of Gaul, Italy, and Africa, would naturally present distinct traits, characteristic of recensions; and these traits would be more clearly discernible to those who possessed not merely fragments, but entire texts. For we may doubt whether even Griesbach or Scholz would have discovered the Greek recensions, however marked, had they been left to work merely on the dismembered quotations of the Fathers.

Now, from both historical and critical evidence, it appears perfectly clear, that in the passage about the *Itala*, St. Augustine meant nothing more than to specify the preference he gave to the text in *Italian* codices; in other words, that the term *Itala* is not an appellative, but a mere relative term, adopted by him because living in Africa.

1. When an individual, whether from accident or choice, has himself adopted a certain text or edition, he will naturally continue its use and give it the preference. From the history of St. Augustine, it is morally certain that the copy or

---

* De Imit. Christi, lib. iv. ad pervetustum exemplar, nec non ad codd. complures ex diversa regione, variis nunc primum lectionibus subjunctis, recensiti. *Par.* 1826.

copies of Scripture which he used must have been Italian. He informs us, that when at Carthage, before his conversion, he utterly despised and neglected the Scriptures, on account of the rudeness of their style.* He went to Milan, without the slightest religious object, and there at length began to view them in a totally different light.† From listening to St. Ambrose, he discovered that many things in them which had appeared to him absurd and ignoble, were full of meaning and dignity. He remained for some time in a state of doubt and wavering; and strong obstacles presented themselves to his complete search after truth. One of these I must give in his own words:—"Ecce jam non sunt absurda in libris ecclesiasticis quæ absurda videbantur, et possunt aliter atque honeste intelligi. Figam pedes meos in eo gradu, in quo puer a parentibus positus eram, donec inveniatur perspicua veritas. Sed ubi quæretur? quando quæretur? Non vacat Ambrosio, non vacat legere. *Ubi ipsos codices quærimus? unde aut quando comparamus? a quibus sumimus?*"‡ Up to this time, therefore, he had to provide himself with a copy of Scripture. Immediately upon his miraculous conversion, he retired to Cassiciacum, the villa of Verecundus, and thence wrote to ask St. Ambrose what books of Scripture he should read. This holy bishop recommended Isaiah, and St. Augustine read it, evidently for the first time. "Veruntamen, ego primam hujus lectionem non intelligens, totemque talem arbitrans, distuli repetendum, excercitatior in dominico eloquio."* Here also he began to read the Psalms.†

---

* Confess. lib. iii. c. 5, tom. i. p. 91.

† Ib. lib. vi. c. 3, 4. pp. 118, 122.

‡ Ib. c. 11, p. 128.

After his baptism, St. Augustine proceeded to Rome. Between his conversion and his return to Africa, he wrote and published several works; as his Soliloquies, his treatises—De Beata Vita, De Ordine, De Libero Arbitrio, De Immortalitate Animæ, De Moribus Manichæorum, and De Moribus Ecclesiæ. Several of these, especially the last, demonstrate, by his facility in quoting Scripture, that he had already completely impressed it on his memory, and studied it deeply. This brief historical sketch must prove that St. Augustine learnt the sacred books entirely from the *Italian* text; and it is highly improbable that upon his return to Africa he cast it aside and adopted another. On the contrary, it is more probable that he would give the preference, through life, to the text which he had first studied.

2. But there is a passage, in one of his polemical works, which seems completely to explain his sentiments and expressions regarding the Itala. Writing against Faustus, he gives a critical rule for deciding among conflicting various readings.

---

* Ib. lib. ix. c. 5, p. 162.

† Ib. c. 4, p. 160.

"Ubi, cum ex adverso audieris 'proba,' non confugias (*a*) ad *exempla veriora*, vel (*b*) plurium codicum, vel (*c*) antiquorum, vel (*d*) linguæ præcedentis, unde hoc in aliam linguam interpretatum est."* His order therefore is 1st, (*a*) to consult MSS. containing a more true or genuine text; 2ndly, (*b*) to weigh the number; 3rdly (*c*) to examine the antiquity, of the testimonies; and 4thly, (*d*) if the point still remain undecided, to recur to the originals. After a few sentences, he proceeds thus: "Quid agis? quo te convertes? quam libri a te prolati (*a*) *originem* quam (*c*) vetustatem, quam (*d*) seriem successionis testem citabis?" By comparing this text with the preceding, and remembering that *number* of MSS. (*b*) is omitted in it, because it treats of the examination of *one* codex, we see that the *exempla veriora* are to be discovered by their *origin;* for one is substituted for the other, in the series of critical authorities. After a few more lines, St. Augustine explains what the *origin* is which has to determine a manuscript to be sincere and authoritative. For he repeats the same series, with a new and important substitution, and in the form of a conclusion from his previous reasoning:—"Itaque si de *fide exemplarium* quæstio verteretur . . . vel (*a*) ex *aliarum regionum codicibus unde ipsa doctrina commeavit* nostra dubitatio dijudicaretur; vel si ibi ipsi quoque codices variarent, (*b*) plures paucioribus, aut (*c*) vetustiores recentioribus præferrentur; et si adhuc esset incerta varietas, (*d*) præcedens lingua, unde illud interpretatum est, consuleretur." On this passage I may be allowed a few remarks. First, St. Augustine by *codices aliarum regionum, etc.*, certainly means Latin copies; for he places a reference to the Greek, the *præcedens lingua*, as the last, and a distinct, resource. Secondly, this passage authorizes us to conclude that different churches did not use distinct versions; for it would be absurd, in a question on a difference of reading, to refer a critic to a totally different and perfectly independent translation.

---

* Adv. Faust. lib. x. c. 2, tom. viii. p. 219

Thirdly, St. Augustine's critical rule is, that in a doubt regarding the correctness of a reading, recourse must be had in the first instance to the copies of that country whence the faith had come. St. Augustine is writing in Africa; we have therefore only to inquire whence did he consider the faith to have been brought into that country; and, from my first observation, it follows that it must be from some Latin church. The belief of the African Church was undoubtedly that Italy, and particularly Rome, wac the fountain of its Christianity. St. Gregory writes as follows to Dominicus, bishop of Carthage:—"Scientes præterea unde in Africanis partibus sumpserit ordinatio sacerdotalis exordium, laudabiliter agitis quod, sedem apostolicam diligendo, ad officii vestri originem, prudenti recordatione recurritis et probabili in ejus affectu constantia permanentis."* And St. Augustine was manifestly of the same opinion, as will appear from the following passage:—"Erat etiam (Carthago) transmarinis vicina regionibus, et fama celeberrima nobilis, unde non mediocris utique auctoritatis habebat episcopum, qui posset non curare conspirantem multitudinem inimicorum, cum se videret et Romanæ ecclesiæ, in qua semper apostolicæ cathedræ viguit principatus, et ceteris terris unde Evangelium in ipsam Africam venit, per communicatorias literas essi conjunctum."† "The Roman Church and *other* countries from which the Gospel had come to Africa," is a phrase sufficiently clear. But I may further remark that the transmarine countries to which Carthage is near, and those *other* churches, are manifestly identified in this passage: for, the bishop's reputation with the former, and his being in communion with the latter, are given as an identical motive of security. Now, there can be no doubt that by the *transmarine* churches he meant those of Italy. For, alluding to the trial of Cecilianus, he says: "An forte non debuit Romanæ ecclesiæ Melchiades episcopus, cum collegis *transmarinis* episcopis, illud sibi usurpare judicium?"* But we learn from St. Optatus, that the colleagues of Pope Melchiades were all Italians, except three Gallican bishops expressly petitioned for by the Donatists.* St. Augustine therefore considered the African Church as descended from the Italian.

---

* Epist. lib. viii. No. 33, ed. Maur. tom. ii. p. 922.

† Ad Glor. Eleus. ep. xliii. (al. clxiii.) vol. ii. p. 91.

‡ Ib p. 94.

We have thus a clear critical rule laid down by this Father, that when, in Africa, any doubt should arise concerning a various reading, a reference to Italian codices, or the Italian recension, should be the first critical operation. Let us now compare with this rule the passage in which the Itala is mentioned, and see if it receives any light from it. First, St. Augustine is speaking there, just as in his work against Faustus, entirely above various readings, and the correction of the text. The sentence immediately preceding is: "Plurimum hic quoque juvat interpretum numerositas, *collatis codicibus*, inspectaque atque discussa, tantum absit falsitas; nam *codicibus emendandis* primitus debet invigilare solertia eorum qui Scripturas nosse desiderant, *ut emendati non emendatis cedant*, EX UNO DUNTAXAT INTERPRETATIONIS GENERE VENIENTES."† Secondly, after thus saying that the more correct *codices* must be preferred, *provided they descend from the same original version*, he proceeds to state which is the text to be preferred; and this he does in the form, not of an assertion, but of a critical canon: "In ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala ceteris *præferatur*." Thirdly, he then goes on, just as in the passage of the work against Faustus, to say, that the Greek is still to be considered a last appeal, even from this: "Et Latinis *quibuslibet* emendandis, Græci adhibeantur."

---

* Adv. Parmen. lib. i. c. 23, ed. Dupin, *Par.* 1702. p. 23.

† De Doctr. Christ. lib. ii. c. 14, tom. iii. pa. i. p. 27.

An impartial consideration of the two passages will, I am sure, convince any one that they are perfectly parallel; that the preference of the Itala is only the preference of the more authentic records of the same version, preserved in the country whence the Gospel had come to Africa; it is a question of manuscripts and recensions, and by no means of versions.

3. Nothing further seems wanting to complete the solution of the proposed difficulty regarding the Itala, but that it should be critically or practically verified. If St. Augustine brought his manuscripts from Italy, and used them in Africa, does his text present the appearances naturally consequent to such a supposition? Does he, though using essentially the same version as the African Fathers, still on some occasions depart from them in a marked manner, when they agree among themselves, and then coincide with the Italian Fathers? The discussion of this point would involve us in a long examination of various readings, which could not possibly prove interesting to the generality of readers, even should the preceding details have proved so. We must therefore be brief. Several years ago, when pursuing the criti-

cal study of Scripture with more leisure, I paid some attention to this point. Though soon interrupted, the examination satisfied me to such a degree, that the theory of the Vulgate here presented to the public, has been repeatedly delivered in the theological courses of this establishment. I will give a few examples of the various readings of the Italian and African Fathers, from some of the first Psalms; whence it will appear, that St. Augustine departs from the African Fathers, and classes with the Italian, wherever the writers of the two nations decidedly range themselves upon opposite sides.

Ps. i. *Psalt. Rom. et Mediol.*, *Codd. Corbej.*, *Sangerm.*, *Amb.*, *Hil.*, *Cassiod.*, *etc.* read "In lege Domini *fuit* voluntas ejus." *Tert.*, *Cyp.*, *Opt.* (*opus imperf. in Mat.*) omit the *fuit*. St. Augustine agrees with the former; and this reading is *tenacior verborum*, the Greek having ἐστι, and has also greater perspicuity.

ii. Tertullian and St. Optatus consider it as the first; St. Augustine, with the Italian Fathers, treats it as the second.

ii. 1. *Cod. Sangerm.*, *Amb.*, *Hil.*, "Quare *fremuerunt* gentes." *Tert.*, *Cyp.*, always "*tumultuatæ sunt.*" St. Aug. with the former.

2. *Sangerm.*, *Amb.*, *Hil.*, "*convenerunt.*" *Tert.* (generally), *Cyp.*, "*congregati sunt.*" St. Aug. with the former.

vi. 6. *Psalt. Rom.*, *Cod. Sangerm.*, *Amb.*, *Hil.*, *Leo*, *Cassiod.*, *Philast.*, *etc.* have "*in in-*

ferno:" *Tert.*, *Lucif.*, *Calar.*,* "*apud inferos.*" St. Aug. with the former.

xviii. 6. *Psalteria*, *Cod. Sangerm.*, *Amb.*, *Hil.*, *Cassiod.*, *Maximus Taur.*, *Philast.*, "sponsus *procedit.*" *Tert.*, *Cyp.*, "*egrediens.*" St. Aug. with the former.

I must leave the further prosecution of this examination to some critic possessed of more leisure than falls to my lot. It is a toilsome, and often an ungrateful, task; for, in general, the various readings are a mass of irregularity and confusion, referable to no law, and hardly open to plausible conjecture. Still, in the portion examined, I doubt whether a single instance can be produced where the African writers stand in united opposition to those of Italy, without St. Augustine siding with the latter. This is sufficient to clear up all difficulties. For while the Fathers of different countries agree sufficiently to prove that they all used the same version, their occasional separation into national classes proves the existence of distinct geographical recensions. And the fact that St. Augustine always agrees with the Italians, added to the historical proofs already given, demonstrates that he used the Italian recension, and not the African; and that he forms a testimony, not of the African but of the Italian Church, in all critical questions regarding Scripture. The important consequences which will be deduced from this conclusion, will justify the length of the discussion. To have given to the words of St. Augustine, on the *Itala* a sense consistent with facts, with his own history and his quotations, and with the total silence of all other ancient writers, will, I trust, be also considered a sufficient apology for want of discretion in the present disquisition.

---

* I consider him an African writer, because Sardinia was really considered as forming the seventh province of Africa, and was part of its diocese. The connection, too, of the two countries is sufficiently marked in ecclesiastical history.

But, excusable as it may be, I feel that my readers have acquired a right to forget what originally led to it, and to expect to be brought back to the point whence we started. It was simply this: St. Augustine, in all his other works, omits the verse of the Three Witnesses; is not the circumstance of its being found in the Santa-Croce manuscript a sufficient proof that the work was not written by that Father? It was to answer this objection that this long discussion was primarily undertaken; and the answer which it furnishes is this:—St. Augustine, in his ordinary works, used the Italian recension from which the verse had been lost at an early period. His *Speculum*, as we learn from Posidius, was written for the unlearned, and hence he made use in it of the African recension, which universally contained the verse. I requested the learned monk who has undertaken the publication of the work to pay particular attention to its various readings, with this view; and he has assured me that they generally agree with the African Fathers in a very remarkable manner.

In the next letter, we will examine the testimony of this manuscript, on the hypothesis that St. Augustine is not its author, and proceed to notice some other points connected with this celebrated controversy. I remain, etc.,

N. Wiseman.

English College, Rome, June 26, 1832.

LETTER THE SECOND.

Dear Sir,—Having discussed the question, whether St. Augustine be the author of the treatise contained in the Santa-Croce manuscript, we must now proceed, according to promise, to investigate what degree of authority it possesses in the controversy of the Three Witnesses, on the supposition that it is the production of a more obscure author. Let me premise a few words on its age and country.

Perhaps a more minute examination of the treatise than it is at present in my power to make, might give more clues than have been gathered from hasty observation: these, however, may prove sufficient for our purpose. The exact manner in which several propositions are laid down, regarding the Trinity, shows that it was composed after the controversies upon that great dogma had arisen in the Church. The chapter from which I have quoted the verse of St. John is headed, "De distinctione *personarum.*" Now the word *persona* does not seem to have been used in the marked sense which it here bears, until the third century. Dr. Waterland has remarked that it is applied by Tertullian to the *hypostases*, or persons of the Trinity.* And, in fact, in the work of that writer against Praxea the word occurs frequently, especially from the eleventh to the fifteenth chapters.† But still, it hardly seems to have become so early a defined theological term. Facundus Hermianensis says, that it only began to be used in the Church upon occasion of the Sabellian heresy, in 257. His words are: "Personarum autem nomen nonnisi cum Sabellius impugnaret Ecclesiam, necessario in usum prædicationis assumptum est, ut qui semper tres crediti sunt . . . communi personarum nomine vocarentur."‡ But this assertion stands in direct opposition to that of St. Gregory Nazianzen, that Sabellianism arose in the West from the use of this word. The Latins, he says, were compelled,

> "Propter egestatem linguæ et rerum novitatem,"

to apply the word person to the B. Trinity; and the consequence was, that Sabellianism arose from a mis-application of the term.* To reconcile these conflicting testimonies we have only to say that the word was indeed in use from the time of Tertullian, though it had not yet acquired that decided, definite, theological determination which the Sabellian controversy, and later, the disagreement at the Council of Alexandria, necessarily gave it. But the manner in which it is used in our treatise shows this to have been composed at a time when this determination had been given.

---

* Waterland's Works, by Van Mildert, vol. iii. p. 200.

† Tert. adv. Prax. pp. 505–508, ed. Rigalt.

‡ Def. trium Capit. lib. ii. p. 19.

There is another circumstance which brings this treatise to a later period. After the section which we have quoted for the text of St. John, is another, directed expressly to prove the divinity of the Holy Ghost. This gives reason to suppose that the controversy upon that important dogma, as distinct from the general question of the Trinity, had already commenced. This will bring down the age of this treatise to the time of the Macedonians, or the middle of the fourth century. The use of the old version in it will not allow us to assign it a much later age, nor inded could we be justified in doing so, by any single consideration drawn from the work itself.

There can be no difficulty in deciding the country to which the treatise belongs. The circumstance of its being united in the same volume with a work of St. Cyprian, which follows it immediately, gives a *primâ facie* evidence in favor of its being African. But this point is completely decided by the marked coincidence of its readings with those of the African Fathers. The publication of the original will place this important point beyond dispute.

---

* ᾽Αλλ᾽ οὐ δυναμένοις (τοῖς ᾽Ιταλοῖς) διὰ τὴν στενότητα τῆς παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς γλώττης, καὶ ὀνομάτων πενίαν, ἀπὸ τῆς οὐσίας τὴν ὑπόστασιν, και διὰ τοῦτο ἀντεισάγουσι τὰ πρόσωπα, ἵνα μὴ τρεῖς οὐσίαι παραδεχθῶσι, τί γίνεται; ὡς λίαν γελοῖον ἢ ἐλεεινόν;—εἶτα Σαβελλιανισμὸς ἐνταῦθα ὑπενοήθη τοῖς τρισὶ προσώποις.—Greg. Nazain. De Laud. Athan. Op. *Paris*, 1602, tom. i. p. 395.

Perhaps, to some readers, it will appear of little consequence to have gained the testimony of an unknown African writer of the fourth century, in favor of the verse. I must, however, acknowledge myself to be of quite a different opinion. We must consider the additional testimony of any African writer of greater authority than that of one from any other part of the Western Church. And the reason for this preference may appear to many still further paradoxical; it is because all the authorities hitherto discovered may be said to be African.

Every one versed in biblical pursuits will be acquainted with that great critical principle, first laid down by Bengel, but not fully established and acted upon till the publication of Griesbach's recensions, that the testimonies in favor of a various reading have not an individual force independent of the recension or family to which they belong; and that a reading must be decided, not by the number of distinct authorities, but by the weight of the recension which contains it.

It is plain that the same principle will apply to any other text as well as to the Greek, in which recensions can be recognized. Having shown that this is the case with the old Vulgate, we may fairly try the evidence in favor of the contested verse of St. John, upon this principle. Now it has been sufficiently observed by all writers upon the controversy, that almost all the testimonies in favor of the verse are African. St. Cyprian, Marcus Celedensis, St. Fulgentius, Victor Vitensis, the four hundred bishops assembled under Hunneric, at Carthage, were all members of the African Church. Maximus the Confessor learnt the passage from the same country;* Eucherius was a Spaniard, and his text is too uncertain to be quoted; Phebadius was a monk of Lerins; both, therefore, probably in communication with the African Church. But while so many authors have observed this consent of writers belonging to one church, they have not placed their testimony in its proper light. They have spoken of them as so many African writers, or even as the body of the African Church, bearing witness to the existence of a passage, but not as the representatives of the African *recension* or *text*, as the voice of a great critical family, whose antiquity and authority, as compared with that of other texts, must be critically ascertained.

---

* See Nolan's Inquiry into the integrity of the Greek Vulgate, p. 302.

Bearing in mind these facts, and especially the one established in the first letter, that the African and Italian Fathers separate into distinct classes, not merely upon this verse, but in many other passages, sufficient to prove the difference of their recensions, I proceed to make such observations as may bear upon the general controversy, in connection with the Santa-Croce manuscript.

1. The existence of an African recension containing the verse, gives us a right to consider as quotations passages of African writers, which, in the works of Italian authors, might be considered doubtful. It is by insisting upon the incomplete form of the citations in Tertullian and St. Cyprian, that Griesbach and others have endeavored to convert them into mere mystical interpretations. Now, the certainty, acquired by the examination of later testimonies, that the entire Church to which they belonged knew and quoted the verse, gives us just critical grounds for assuming theirs to be real quotations. The system followed by the opposers of the text, of attributing to respect for St. Cyprian and Tertullian, first the allusion to the preceding verse, and then its conversion into a new text, is utterly untenable. These two writers were held in equal, perhaps in greater, veneration in Italy; and there is no reason why their writings should have influenced other African authors more than their admirers beyond the sea. And at any rate, why

did not St. Augustine follow the same course? why was he not led to *argue*, as the other African writers are said to have done, from the eighth verse allegorically explained? Why is he said never to have quoted the verse?

2. But if, instead of an argument, we consider these passages as quotations; if instead of African writers, we will only speak of the African text, we remove a difficulty which has appeared insoluble to all parties—the silence of St. Augustine. It has been observed, with great appearance of strength, by a late writer,* that this Father, who has written so much upon this Epistle, has furnished Sabatier with materials for restoring the whole of it up to this point, and returns to his assistance immediately after it; but totally fails him in this verse. This at first sight, appears a negative argument of considerable strength. I would even allow that, upon the ordinary view of the controversy, it is unanswerable. But the positions already laid down remove every difficulty. The verse belongs essentially to the African text, and this writer used the Italian. All anomaly, all difficulty, is at an end. We might indeed almost venture to say that were the verse to be found in St. Augustine's works, the circumstance would require an explanation. This could probably be easily found, and I have suggested it on a former occasion, from his con-

---

* Horæ Biblicæ, by C. Butler, Esq. Works. *Lond.* 1817, vol. i. p. 396.

nection with the African Church, and the propriety he might occasionally find of adopting a less favorite text, to consult the feelings or utility of the people. But still, in all classifications or distributions into families, it is the sporadic varieties, as they are called by naturalists, which perplex and disarrange. The more rounded and decidedly pronounced the limits of each class, the more defined the laws and circumstances by which they are regulated, the freer they are from exceptions, the more determinate likewise the extent and value of each: so much the more satisfactory is all reasoning upon them. So far then from St. Augustine's silence being a difficulty in proving the text, it rather removes an embarrassment.

From these remarks it follows that the discovery of an early African writer, however insignificant in other respects, who quotes the disputed verse, goes further to strengthen the real evidence in its favor than the testimony of an Italian writer of far greater celebrity; because the former would always tend to consolidate and complete the authority of a recension; while the other would only give an individual and an *anomalous* voice. And this principle defines the weight of the testimony afforded by the Santa-Croce manuscript. It is a new addition to the combined evidence of the African writers, in favor of the verse having existed in the text or recension of that Church.

Having thus reduced the controversy to a contest between two recensions, the African and Italian, it remains to inquire—which of these has claims to the greater authority; which can justly be considered the true representative of the original version? For should it appear highly probable, or even certain, that the Latin translation was really made in Africa, and that consequently the African text, preserved by the writers of that Church, ascends to a higher antiquity not only than the Italian, but than any Greek manuscript in existence, we gain an argument much more compact, defined, and solid, for the authenticity of the controverted verse, than by the usual balancing of quotations and texts.

Mr. Nolan has given several reasons why the authority of the African Church should be considered grave and weighty on this point;* but does not enter upon the only true means of deciding the controversy, the determination of, which is the original text.

It is but justice, not so much to myself as to the cause which I am upholding, to premise that the examination which follows was undertaken, like that in my former letter, without reference to this controversy, being the result of inquiries made for academical purposes, when treating of the Vulgate in a course of theological lectures.

A palimpsest of a Latin antehieronyman version having been discovered some years ago at

---

* Inquiry, p. 295.

Würtzburg, Dr. Feder transcribed all that was legible, comprising Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. These fragments he transmitted to the late learned Dr. Münter, bishop of Seeland, who published an account of them in a letter addressed to the well-known M. Grégoire. This appeared in the *Revue Encyclopédique* for March, 1819, p. 545. The latter is dated Copenhagen, February 7. In this letter he supposes these fragments to be of African origin; he says they cannot belong to the Itala, because they want the "perspicuity of sentence." He promises to publish them: and if I remember right, they have been given in the third number of the *Miscellanea Hafnensia;* but not having that journal at hand, I cannot ascertain it at present: I have certainly seen them in some such publication.

Eichhorn, however, was the first author who hazarded a general conjecture that the Latin Vulgate was originally made in Africa. This is strictly a conjecture, for he attempts no demonstration of his grounds. The principal, or rather the only real one is, the barbarism of the language in which it is written.* Against the term barbarism, we must protest; and we have the suffrage for so doing of the celebrated lexicographer Gesner, who used to say that he considered the Vulgate as a classical author, since it enabled him to survey the Latin language in its full extent.†

---

* Einleitung in das A. T. Ed. 4, *Gotting.* 1823, vol. ii. p. 406

† Michaelis's Introd. by Marsh, vol. ii. p. 115.

Instead of such vague conjecture, let us try to collect some specific proofs tending, in my humble opinion, to demonstrate that Africa is the birthplace of the Latin version.

First, it may be remarked, that Greek literature was brought into such repute in Italy, under the Cæsars, but especially under Trajan and the Antonines, that a version of the Scriptures would be there hardly necessary. It is singular that almost all the names which occur in the history of the early Roman Church are Greek; as Cletus, Anacletus, Soter, Eleutherius, Linus, Evaristus, Telesphorus, Hyginus. Several of these were in fact Greeks by birth, and their election to the pontificate indicates the preponderance of that nation in the Roman Church, and the acquaintance of their flock with the Greek language. But this is much better demonstrated by the fact, that for the two first centuries, and even later, we have hardly a single instance of an ecclesiastical writer, belonging to the Italian Church, composing his works in any language but Greek.

The epistle of St. Clement, or Clemens *Romanus*, as he is emphatically called, was written about the year 96, in Greek.* He was really a Roman by birth, but there is nothing in his writings to indicate either that he used a translator, or wrote that language with an effort. We may add, that the letter is written in the name of the whole Roman Church.

---

* Eusebius, H. E. lib. iii. c. xvi. p. 107, ed. Reading.

I need not mention St. Justin and Tatian; as neither can be said to have been a member of the Italian Church, though both published their Greek writings in Rome.

Modestus, who is placed by Cave about the year 176, seems by his name to have been a Latin, and yet appears to have written in Greek; for St. Jerome says, "Feruntur sub nomine ejus et alia συνταγματα."[*] Eusebius mentions him in conjunction with St. Irenæus.[†]

There seems no reason to doubt that the correspondence between the churches of Rome and Corinth, under Soter, was carried on in Greek.[‡]

St. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, in 178, wrote his works entirely in the same language. The celebrated letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, is likewise in Greek.

St. Jerome says that Tertullian is the oldest Latin writer after Victor and *Apollonius*.[§] The first is undoubtedly the pope of that name: the history of the second is more obscure. In St. Jerome's catalogue, two writers of this name are mentioned. The second of these was a Roman senator, who composed an Apology, and certainly wrote in Greek.[‖] For in another place he is mentioned among Greek writers;* and there is no doubt but he is the same person whose Apology Eusebius published.† He probably wrote some other works in Latin: it is sufficient for our present purpose that he should have indifferently used either language.

---

[*] De Viris Illust. c. xxxii. tom. ii. p. 858, ed. Vallars.

[†] Lib. iv. c. 25, p. 188.

[‡] Ib. lib. v. c. xxi. p. 239.

[§] Lo. cit. c. liii. p. 875.

[‖] Ib. c. xlii. p. 869.

Caius, the celebrated Roman priest, about 212, is generally acknowledged to have drawn up his numerous treatises in the Greek language. This is solidly established by Tillemont, followed by Lardner.‡

The dialogue against Artemon, the author of which is unknown, appears manifestly, from the fragments given by Eusebius,§ and from other circumstances, to have been written at Rome by some ecclesiastic; and yet it seems undoubtedly to have been composed in Greek.

Asterius Urbanus seems by his name to have been an Italian, and yet appears to have written and disputed in Greek. His work was dedicated to Abercius Marcellus. By Eusebius's account, it was accident that led him to Galatia, where his conferences took place.‖

St. Hippolytus Portuensis is supposed by some to have been bishop of Portus Romanus, or Adan, in Arabia; by others, of Portus, now Porto, at the mouth of the Tiber. The grounds for both opinions may be seen in Lardner,* who, however, has omitted the circumstance that the church of Porto, and a well there held in great veneration, bears his name. The question is immaterial; Hippolytus lived and wrote in Rome. His paschal cycle may be seen engraved on his chair in the Vatican Library. It is in Greek, as were all his works.

---

* Ep. ad Magn. lxx. tom. i. p. 427.

† H. E. lib. v. c. 21, p. 189.

‡ Works. *Lond.* 1827, vol. i. p. 396.

§ Lib. v. c. 28, p. 195, seqq.

‖ Ib. c 16, p. 182.

From these instances, the only ones on record, it appears that Victor was the only author belonging to the Roman, Italian, or Gallic Church, who is recorded to have written in Latin before A. D. 230; and there are not wanting grounds to conjecture that he likewise understood Greek. In the meantime, not a Greek ecclesiastical writer appears in Africa, while, on the other hand, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, Lactantius, and Minucius Felix, who are the earliest Latin Fathers, were of that nation. Add to this, that St. Mark's Gospel is acknowledged by ancient writers to have been drawn up for the instruction of the Roman Church, and yet was written in Greek; and that St. Paul addressed his epistle to that Church in the same language. It would be strange that they should have acted thus, if a translation into Latin had been necessary; and we must therefore conclude that Greek was perfectly understood by the faithful there; and so it would continue for some time. This in fact appears from the proofs given above.

---

* Ubi sup. p. 426.

From these reflections results a strong ground of historical probability that the first Latin version was not made in Italy, but in Africa. And this is more than a mere conjecture. For we have positive proof, in the quotations of African writers, that such a version did exist in their country before the fourth century; while the whole historical evidence which we possess regarding Italy, leads us to conclude that the Greek text was used there till the commencement of that age. Now, having in my former letter shown that the version used in the two countries was identical, it will follow that the Italian text was imported from Africa.

But the most satisfactory method of determining the country of the Vulgate must be by an examination of its words and phrases. The result of such an examination will be twofold. First, we shall discover that it abounds in archaisms, or antiquated forms of expression, only found in writers anterior to the Augustan age. This will plead strongly for the provincial origin of the version; since such peculiarities would be longer preserved at a distance than in the vicinity of the capital. And whoever has made any study of the African writers of the first centuries, will have remarked how many of these are preserved by them.* In the examples now to be produced, this will sometimes appear. Indeed, it is probable that the old Vulgate may have originally contained more of these archaisms than now remain, in consequence of its various corrections. For instance, the old copy of St. Matthew, published by Monsignor Mai, in his *Sciptorum Veterum Nova Collectio*, tom. iii. Rome, 1828, has, Matt. iv. 18 (p. 257), the word *retiam* for *retem*. Now this confirms the same reading in Plautus, quoted by Priscian:* "Nam tunc et operam ludos fecisset et *retiam*."† Secondly, we shall discover many decided Africanisms, or expressions found in none but African writers, nearest in age to the old version.‡ The principal of these is of

---

* Arnobius, for instance, often uses words and grammatical forms manifestly antiquated. It would be easy to give

---

many examples. Thus, lib. i. *adv. Gent.* p. 35 (Lugd. Batav. 1651), he uses the word *Stribiligines*. Of this word Aul. Gellius, *Noct. Att.* lib. v. cap. xx. p. 341 (ed. Gronov. Lugd. Bat. 1706), says: "*Solœcismus. . vetustioribus* Latinis *stribiligo* dicebatur, quasi *sterobiligo* quædam." In the passage referred to, of Arnobius, he is excusing the rude style of Scripture; probably of the original. Comp. Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* Again, Arnobius often uses the old form of the passive infinitive, as p. 160, *velarier* and *coronarier*; p. 186, *convestirier*. See note, p. 5.

[*] P. 759, ed. Putsch. This is the edition which I shall always quote, of the grammarians.

[†] Rud. act. iv. sc. i. 9.

[‡] Whoever has read the early Christian writers belonging to the African Church, must be struck with the family air which prevails through them, chiefly in the use of particular words and forms, not commonly found, except perhaps occasionally in old writers. Thus the word *stricului*, or, as some editions write it, *hystriculus*, for "a boy," occurs only in Arnobius (lib. v. p. 174) and Tertullian (*De Pallio*, c. iv.).

course Tertullian. The examples which will be given, and which may at least suffice to turn the attention of more skilful philologers to the subject, will be almost confined to the New Testament, the Psalms, and Ecclesiasticus, which have been preserved from the old Vulgate in the version used by the Church. I will place the references to authors in the text, not to confuse and fatigue the reader by referring him every moment to the foot of the page.

I. A common archaism, or, as it is often erroneously called, solecism, in the old version, is the use of deponents with a passive signification. Priscian expressly tells us that this is an archaism:—"Ex his multa *antiqui* tam passiva quam activa significatione protulisse inveniuntur" (p. 790).

The older editions have *ustricolas*, which makes no sense. Arnobius often uses *qu* instead of *c*, as "*arquata* sella" (lib. ii. p. 59,) *arquitenens*, *hirquinus* (p. 165), etc. This arises from a confusion common in old writers. We find the same interchange of letters, though in the contrary form (*c* being used for *qu*), in Tertullian, who, for example, has *licet* for *liquet*. (*De Pœnit.* c. vi. I quote here, accidentally, from the old Paris ed. of 1545; in other places from Rigaltius's edition.) Plautus and Terence made the same confusion. Heraldus (*Animadv. ad Arnob.* p. 77) seems to consider this an Africanism; but from Gellius's remarks on *lance* and *inque*, it seems to have been common to old writers. (Lib. xiii. c. 9. p. 282.) I could bring together many other instances; several will occur in the text. It would be also easy to point out other resemblances of phraseology between Tertullian and Lactantius, or St. Cyprian, but this is not necessary.

Again: "Multa similiter ancipiti terminatione, in una eademque significatione prætulerunt *antiqui*" (p. 799). Whence it appears that these deponent verbs were anciently active. In another place (p. 797), he says of deponent verbs: "Præterea plurima inveniuntur *apud vetustissimos* quæ contra consuetudinem, activam pro passiva habent terminationem." Among these he enumerates *consolo* and *horto*. Aulus Gellius (lib. xv. c. 13, p. 681) says precisely the same of these two verbs. Both words occur passively, 2 Cor. i. 6. The first is also used, Psalm cxviii. 52; Luke xvii. 25.

A similar instance is Heb. xiii. 16: "Talibus enim hostiis *promeretur* Deus." That *mereo* in the past tenses, was often used, could easily be shown by reference to the classics. *Promereo*, however, does not appear to have been used by writers of the golden age with the same facility. Nonius (*De Cont. Gen. Verb.* Opp. p. 475, ed. Par. 1641) has an article on *promeres*, for *promereris*; and quotes Plautus (*Trinum.* act. iii. sc. ii. 15) for it. It occurs often in him (as *Amphit.* act. v. sc. ii. 12) and Terence (*And.* act. ii. sc. i. 30; *Adelph.* act. ii. sc. i. 47). It is also used by Ovid, and perhaps some others. But besides the evident archaism of the word, it seems to merit notice from its signification of *propitiating by sacrifice*, which it does not bear in any classical writer; and, as far as I know, occurs nowhere but in Arnobius, an African, who says: "Ita nihil prodest *promereri* velle per hostias Deos lævos." (*Adv. Gent.* lib. vii. p. 229.)

The passive *ministrari* often occurs in the New Testament; as Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45; 2 Cor. viii. 19, 20; 2 Peter i. 11. This is hardly to be found in true Italian writers. Plautus is quoted by Nonius as having "Boni *ministrantur*, illum nunc irrident mali." The older editions, however, as the one quoted above (p. 138), have "Boni *immiserantur*, illhunc irrident mali." Columella also, a native of Cadiz, though an elegant writer, uses the word (lib. xii. 1).

The termination of the future of verbs of the fourth conjugation in *ibo* is preserved occasionally by the translator of the Vulgate, as Psalm lix. 8, *partibor* and *metibor*, and is set down by the old grammarians as an antiquated form. Nonius gives many examples, always from the oldest writers; as Ennius, Accius, Novius. These are *reddibo*, *expedibo* (p. 476,) *esuribo*, *invenibo* (p. 479), *audibo* (p. 505), *aperibo* (p. 506), *operibo* and *oboedibo* (p. 506), etc. It is singular that Charisius (*Instit. Gram.* p. 222, ed. Putsch) should give *feribo* as the regular future of *ferio*. Yet Horace has (*Od.* ii. 17, v. 32), "Nos humilem *feriemus* agnum." He has, however (*Od.* iii. 23, v. 19), "*Mollibit* adversos Penates." The form, nevertheless, always remains a decided archaism.

In the old Vulgate, the verb *odio* was used even more markedly than now appears; though as yet some tenses not used in the classics remain;

as *odientes.* So in the fragment of St. Matthew's Gospel before referred to, in ch. v. ver. 44 (p. 259), we have *odiunt,*and again, vi. 24 (p. 260), *odiet.* Tertullian quotes: "Non *odies* fratrem tuum," from Levit. xix. 6 (*adv. Marcion.* lib. iv. c. 35), where St. Augustine reads *odio habebis.* (Quæst. lxx. in Levit. tom. iii. p. 520.) Festus (*sub voce*) says the ancients used the verb *odio ;* but examples are hardly to be met, except in Tertullian, who has *odientes* (*ib.* c. xvi.), *oditur* (*Apolog.* c. iii.). It is once attributed to Petronius Arbiter; but *audientes* is the better reading. Were it not for the authority of Festus, I should consider this an Africanism.

Matt. xxii. 30, we have the word *nubentur.* Nonius tells us, that "nubere, *veteres*, non solum mulieres sed viros dicebant." (p. 143.) The expression may thus be considered an archaism; however, it is used this way almost exclusively by African writers. Tertullian says (*ad Uxor.* lib. i. c. 1), "Apud Patriarchas, non modo *nubere*, sed etiam multifariam matrimoniis uti fas fuit." (Cf. c. 7.) Again (*adv. Marc.* lib. iv. c. 38), "Præstruxit hic quidem *nubi*, ubi sit et mori." So Plautus (*Persæ.* act. iii. sc. i. 58), "Cujusmodi hic cum fama facile *nubitur.*" St. Jerome also, who often seems to imitate the African writers, whom he so much admired, uses it; but perhaps he alludes to the text of St. Matt. (Ep. xxii. No. 19.)

Ps. lxi. 7. "*Emigrabit* te de tabernaculo tuo." A manifest archaism. It is quoted by Nonius from Titinnius (p. 2). "Quot pestes, senia, jurgia *sesemet* diebus *emigrarunt*;" corrected by later critics into "sese meis ædibus emigrarunt." Gellius uses it:* "Atque ita cassita nidum *migravit*." (Lib. ii. c. xxx. p. 201.) Thysicus, in his Commentary, remarked that it is an obsolete phrase. Gronovius denies it, and appeals to Cicero (*De Offic.* lib. i. c. 10). But though he uses it there and elsewhere (as *De Fin.* lib. iii. c. 20; *De Leg.* lib. iii. c. 4), it is always in the sense of transgressing a law or duty; in which Tertullian also has (*De Cor. Mil.* c. 18), "Nec dubita quosdam scripturas *emigrare*." But the meaning of these words is very obscure.

I hardly know whether I should instance the phrase *contumeliam facere*, which occurs often; as 2 Mac. vii. 27; Luke xi. 47; Heb. xi. 29, and once in St. Jerome's version, Mic. vii. 6. Some readers will probably remember Cicero's severe criticism on the expression, when used by Antonius. (*Phil.* iii. § 9.) "Quid est porro *facere contumeliam?* quis sic loquitur?" This, however, does not apply to our phrase; as Quintilian (*Inst.* lib. ix. c. 3) tells us it had been there used passively, in the same manner as we may say, *facere jacturam.* The passage of Cicero has nevertheless been a fruitful field for ingenious critics, as my readers may satisfy themselves by consulting Muretus (*Var. Lec.* lib. vi. c. 18), or the elder Gronovius (*Observat.* lib. iii. c. 8, ed. 2, p. 488). However, I believe the phrase, even actively, will hardly be found in any but the oldest writers. It occurs in a fragment of a speech by Q. Metellus Numidicus, preserved by A. Gellius (lib. xii. c. ix. p. 564): "Tanto vobis quam mihi majorem *contumeliam facit.*" It is remarkable how Gellius, having to repeat the sentiment in his own name, carefully avoids this turn, and explains it by "majori vos contumeliia affecit quam me." It is also found in Plautus (*Asin.* act. ii. sc. iv. 82) and Terence (*Hecyr.* act. iii. sc. v.; *Phorm.* act. v. sc. vii.).

---

* The occurrence of a phrase in A. Gellius can be no argument of its not being an archaism. On the contrary, his constant study of the older writers familiarized him with their expressions, and led him to use them. Hence Salmasius says of him, "Antonianorum ævo Agellius (A. Gellius) politissime et elegantissime scripsit, et prorsus ἀρχαικὸν dicendi modum imitatus est." (*De Hellen.* p, 37.) Hence we shall often see him in the text confirming alone expressions found in Tertullian, or other writers of his class.

Thus far I have given a few specimens of the archaisms of the old Vulgate, many of which are to be found principally in African writers. I will now proceed to give what I consider examples of its Africanisms.

II. We cannot fail to be struck with the extraordinary number of words compounded with *super*, which occur in the parts of the Vulgate belonging to the old version. I will give a list of those which are not to be found in any profane writer; and it is singular to observe, in contrast, that St. Jerome in his part has not one which is not sanctioned by classical authorities, except *superexaltatus* which he preserved from the old version. Ps. xxxiv. 19, 24, xxxvii. 17, *supergaudeo*; xxxvi. 35, Jac. ii. 12, *superexalto;* Ps. lvii. 9, *supercado;* lxxi. 16, *superextollo;* cxviii. 43, etc. *superspero;* Eccles. xliii. 32, *supervaleo;* 4 Esdras (*Apocrypha*) vii. 23, *superdico ;* xv. 6, *superpolluo ;* 29, *superinvalesco ;* vi. 20, *supersignor;* Matt. vi. 11, *supersubstantialis ;* xiii. 25, *supersemino :* xxv. 20, *superlucror ;* Luc. vi. 38, *supereffluens ;* x. 35, *supererogo ;* 1 Cor. vii. 36, *superadultus ;* 2 Cor. v. 4, *supervestior ;* xvi. 15, *superimpendor ;* Jud. iii. *supercerto.* I have given this long list because it seems decidedly to point out a class of words indicative of a dialectic tendency. To it I may add the word *superædifico*, which occurs seven times in the New Testament, though nowhere among classical writers. Perhaps these words abounded even more in older copies; for Tertullian (*adv. Gnostic.* c. 13), quoting Rom. viii. 37, has the verb *supervenio ;* whereas our copies have *supero.* Now it is singular to observe precisely the same tendency in the writings of this African, nearest in age to the Latin version; and I will therefore give a list of words of the same form, found in no other ancient writer but himself: *Superinduco* (*adv. Hermog.* c. 26); *superargumentor* (*ib.* c. 37); *superacervo* (*adv. Nat.* lib. i. c. 15); *superfrutico* (*adv. Valent.* c. 39); *superinductitus* (*adv. Marcion.* lib v. c. 3); *superordino* (*ib.*

c. 5) *superindumentum* (*ib.* c. 12; *De Resur. Car.* c. 42); *superextollo* (*De Resur.* c. 24); *superterrenus* (*ib.* c. 49); *supercœlestis* (*ib.* et. *De Anima*, c. 23); *superinundo* (*ib.* c. ult.); *supermundialis* (*De Anima*, c. 18); *supersapio* (*ib*); *superseminator* (*ib.* c. 16); *supermetior* (*ib.* c. 38); *supernomino* (*Apol.* c. 18); *superscendo* (*De Pœnit.* c. 10); *supervecto* (*De Baptis.* c. 4). And to come to one specific comparison, Tertullian has also the word *superædificatio* (*adv. Marcion.* lib. v. c. 6), which is likewise used by Victorinus, no less an African. (*Mai. Scriptor. Vet.* ut sup. p. 112.) Certainly, it would be difficult, or rather impossible, to cull from any other two such small collections of writings as those I have cited, such a number of compound words of the same form, not to be found elsewhere. For both in the Vulgate and Tertullian, or rather the small portions of each which I have quoted, I have passed over many compounds of this form, which they respectively have in common with other writers.

Another no less striking class of words, peculiar to the Vulgate and African writers, consists of verbs terminating in *ifico;* many of which were afterwards received as established ecclesiastical words. The following instances may suffice to illustrate this point. *Mortifico* is often used for *to kill.* Ps. xxxvi. 42; xliii. 22; lxxviii. 11; Rom. viii. 36, etc. St. Jerome has once or twice adopted it into his version. Even in those passages where, from the ecclesiastical use of the word, we translate it by *mortify*, as Rom. vii. 4; viii. 13; it in reality signifies to *kill*; as *mortificatio*, 2 Cor. iv. 10, undoubtedly signifies *death*, or as the Douay version renders it, *dying*. But upon these renderings I may have occasion to speak more at length on another occasion. Suffice it to say, that this verb *mortifico*, with its derivatives, is nowhere found in classical authors, but is most common in Tertullian, who uses it without the least reference to these texts. Thus (*De Resur.* c. 57), "Caro non prodest quidquam *mortificatur* enim." Again (*adv. Marc.* lib. v. c. 9): "Quod si sic in Christo vivificamur omnes, sicut *mortificamur* in Adam, quando in Adam corpore *mortificamur*, sic necesse est et in Christo corpore *vivificemur*. Cæterum similitudo non constat, si non in eadem substantia *mortificationis* in Adam, *vivificatio* occurret in Christo." It may be proper to notice a passage in Festus (*De Verb. Signif.* Amst. 1700, lib. ix. p. 253), who explains the word *munitio* by *mortificatio ciborum*. Scaliger how-proposes to read *morsificatio*. Meursius, however, prefers retaining the usual reading, but deriving the word from *mortare conterere*, which is not, I believe, to be found in any ancient writer. *Vivifico* is another scriptural word not used by profane writers. It is almost superfluous to cite examples, as it occurs in nearly every book. St. Jerome was driven to the necessity of often adopting it, as the idea of giving or restoring life is so essentially Christian, that no heathen word could have been found to express it. We have seen examples from Tertullian both of the verb and substantive. He also has the word *vivificator* (*De Resur.* c. 37; *adv. Marc.* ii. 9). *Glorifico* occurs as frequently as the last word, and has been likewise received into the second Vulgate. The oldest authority for it is once more Tertullian. (*Idol.* c. 22; *adv. Prax.* c. 25, sæpius.) *Clarifico* is found only in the old version, as, 3 Esd. viii. 28, 82; ix. 53; Jo. xii. 18, 23, 28, etc.; Gal. i. 24, and elsewhere. The older editions of Pliny had the word (*Hist. Nat.* lib. xx. c. 13), in the sense of *clearing* ("*visum clarificat*"); but F. Hardouin, from MSS., restored *compurgat.* The oldest authority for its bibilical sense is Lactantius (lib. iii. c. 18); and the noun *clarificatio* is first met with in St. Augustine (*De Div. Quæst.* c. lxii. tom. vi. p. 37), both Africans. *Sanctifico* is another verb unknown to profane writers, yet found very frequently in the Vulgate. It is used by Tertullian, in commenting on the Lord's Prayer (*De Orat*, c. 3), and in other places (*Exhort. ad. Cast.* c. 7), as also *sanctificator* (*adv. Prax.* c. 2; *S. Aug. Conf.* lib. x. c. 34), and *sanctificatio* (*Exhort.* c. 1). *Salvifico* belongs to the same class, and occurs Jo. xii. 27, 47. Sedulius uses it, but evidently in allusion to this passage (lib. vi. 7). Tertullian, according to some editions, has the word *salvificator* (*De Pudicit.* c. 2): "*Salvificator* omnium hominum maxime fidelium." The older editions, however, have *salutificator.* *Justi-*

fico is another common scriptural term unknown to the classics, and is to be found in almost every book of Tertullian, in every possible form. (*Adv. Marcion.* lib. ii. c. 19, iv. 17; *De Orat.* c. 13, etc.) *Magnifico* too, is often used in a sense unknown to classical writers, for, to *make great;* as Ps. xvii. 54; lvi. 11. I do not know that it is found in this sense in Tertullian. We have thus eight examples of words of a peculiar form, perfectly unknown to the classics, but almost all in common use among African writers, nearest to the age of the Vulgate. But were it to be urged that even these may have derived them from this version, and that, if inventions, they may equally be the productions of Italy, I would reply, that decidedly this does not appear probable. For, besides these words, others of the very same form are constantly to be found in these African writers, known to no other authors; and therefore it seems probable that they were in the habit of using or coining such words, and that with them this was a favorite form. To give a few instances: Tertullian has the extraordinary word *angelifico* (*De Resur. Car.* c. 25): "Quæ illam (carnem) manent in regno Dei reformatam et *angelificatam.*" He has also the derivatives *salutificator* (*ib.* c. 47; *De Car. Christi*, c. 14), and *vestificina* (*De Pallio* c. 3), and *deificus* (*Apol.* c. 11). In like manner Arnobius often uses the word *auctifico* for to *honor* especially the gods by sacrifice (*adv. Gent.* pp. 224, 233); a word peculiar to himself, as the others are to Tertullian.

Ephes. v. 4, we have the word *stultiloquium;* Matt. vi. 7, *multiloquium;* preserved also in Prov. x. 19. These words are probably found in no ancient writer but Plautus, who has *stultiloquium* (*Mil. Glor.* act. ii. sc. iii. 25), *stultiloquus* (*Pers.* act. iv. sc. iii. 45), and *stultiloquentia* (*Trinum.* act. i. sce. ii. 185); in like manner, *multiloquium* (*Mercat.* prolog. 31), *Multiloquus* (*Pseud.* act. iii. sc. ii. 5; *Cistel.* act. i. sc. iii. 1). What strongly confirms the Africanism of these compounds is the recurrence of similar forms in Tertullian; as *turpiloquium* (*De Pudicit.* c. 17), *spurciloquium* (*De Resurrec. Car.* c. 4), and even *risiloquium* (*De Pœnit.* c. 10). The words *vaniloquus* (Tit. i. 10), and *vaniloquium* (1 Tim. i. 6), belong to the same class; the first is used, in the sense it has in the text, only by Plautus (*Amph.* act. i. sc. i. 223); though in a different sense, occasionally, by others. The second is found in no ancient author.

The text just quoted has brought another under my eye (Tit. i. 7), where we have the Greek compound αἰσχροκερδῆ rendered by *turpis lucri cupidum.* Plautus uses this very phrase, but in a compound form: "*Turpilucricupidum* vocant te cives tui." (*Trinum.* act. i. sc. ii. 63.)

Condignus is a favorite word with the translator of the old Vulgate. We have it for instance, 2 Mac. iv. 38; Rom. viii. 18. It is often used by Plautus (*Amph.* act. i. sc. iii. 39; see also *Cass.* act. i. v. 42: *Bacch.* act. iii. sc. ii. 8), and once or twice by A. Gellius (pp. 51, 222). It is a common word with Arnobius. (Lib. i. p. 1, 15; ii. 55).

Minoro and its derivative *minoratio* are entirely confined to the old parts of the Vulgate, where they very frequently occur. The verb for instance, Ps. lxxxviii. 46; Ecclus. xxxi. 40; xli. 3; 2 Mac. xiii. 19; 2 Cor. viii. 15; Heb. ii. 9; and often elsewhere: the noun, Ecclus. xx. 11; xxxix. 23; xl. 27. These words are only to be found among African writers. Tertullian often uses the verb: "Perit anima si *minoratur*" (*De Anima*, c. 43); "a quo et *minoratus* canitur in psalmo modicum quid citra angelos" (*adv. Prax.* c. 7, repeated in *De Cor. Mil.* c. 14). The noun I have only met in Ferrandus Carthaginiensis, who has, "Æqualitas quippe ejus secundum divinitatem non accepit initium, *minoratio* secundum carnem accepit initium." (*Script. Vet.* ubi sup. p. 172.) Tertullian also has the verb *diminoro.* (*De Anima*, c. 33; *adv. Prax.* c. 15, where *minoro* is repeated.)

Levit. xx. 20, the old version had, "Non accedat ad ministerium Dei si fuerit . . . *ponderosus;*" for which word St. Jerome substituted *herniosus.* Probably the only passage in which this adjective occurs in the same sense is one of Arnobius (lib. vii. p. 240): "Ingentium herniarum magnitudine *ponderosi.*"

A word often used in the old Vulgate, and once adopted by St. Jerome (Zac. xiii. 7), merits our notice, from the peculiar signification it bears. This is *framea*, in the sense of a *sword*, which it always has in the Vulgate; as, Ps. ix. 7; xvi. 7; xxi. 21; 4 Esd. xiii. 9, etc. Tacitus informs us of the origin of this word:—"*Hastas*, vel ipsorum vocabulo *frameas*, gerunt, angusto et brevi ferro, sed ita acri et ad usum belli habili, ut eodem telo, prout ratio poscit, vel cominus *vel eminus* pugnent." (*De Mor. Germ.* c. 6.) Wachter derives the word from the old Teutonic *frumen*, *to throw* (*Glossar. Germ.* Lips. 1737, tom. i. p. 471); but St. Augustine (*Epist.* 140, tom. ii. p. 437; cf. tom. v. p. 1259) expressly tells us that the word meant a *sword;* and thus gives us an African testimony for the meaning it has in the Vulgate, though quite at variance with the signification it bears in the classics.

Improperium is a word of frequent recurrence in our version, and confined, as well as its verb *impropero*, to the old parts. It is doubtful whether any classical authority exists for either; certainly not for the noun. Some editions have the verb in Plautus (*Rud.* act. iii. sc. iv. 48); but perhaps *opprobras* is the better reading. We meet with both words in some Arian sermons, published by Mai, which appear to me decidedly of African origin:—"Ne ab aliquo super eo *improperium* accipiat." (*Script. Vet.* p. 219.) A few lines lower the verb occurs.

The noun *pascua*, as a feminine, comes often in the old Vulgate; as, Ps. xxii. 2; lxxviii. 13;

and has been even preserved in the new. This form is unknown to the classics, but found in Tertullian:—"Quæ illi accuratior *pascua* est." (*Apol.* c. 22.)

The adjective *linguatus* occurs in the book of Ecclesiasticus, viii. 4; xxv. 27. Tertullian once more is the only authority in whom it has been found:—"Apostolus Athenis expertus est *linguatam* civitatem." (*De Anima*, c. 3.)

I do not know whether I should mention the words *salvo*, *salvator*, *salvatio*, for which the earliest authorities are African: as, Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* lib. iii. c. 18), Lactantius, Victorinus, (*Scriptor. Vet.* p. 24, et alibi), who has *salvatio*. These words are essentially Christian; hence St. Augustine says: "*Salvare* et *salvator* non fuerunt hæc Latina, antequam veniret Salvator, quando ad Latinos venit, et hæc Latina fecit." (*Serm.* ccxcix. sec. 6, tom. v. p. 1213). In fact, Cicero tells us that the Greek word σωτὴρ "Latino uno verbo exprimi non potest." (*In Ver.* 4. c. 63.)

Evacuare often occurs in the New Testament, for the Greek καταργέω, to *render useless*, *destroy*, etc.:—1 Cor. xiii. 8, 10; xv. 24; Gal. v. 11, and often elsewhere. Occasionally it corresponds to the verb κενόω, as 1 Cor. i. 17. Tertullian, quoting 1 Cor. vi. 13, has, "Deus autem et hunc et hanc *evacuabit*" (*Ep. de Cibis Jud.* post med.), where we now read *destruet*. Thus also he has, in the old editions, "hanc *evacuationem* et subjectionem bestiarum pollicetur." (*Adv. Marcion* lib. iv. c. 24, al. 40.) He has just quoted Is. xxvii. 1, and consequently means *killing*, or *destruction*. I think I have met with these words in him oftener; but cannot find the places. *Vacuus* is often used by him in the sense of *unsubstantial*, *not solid;* as, "phanatasma res *vacua*" (*ib.* c. 20); as it is by Arnobius, "periculum cassum et *vacuum*" (lib. ii. p. 44). In the first passage of Tertullian, Rigaltius, it is fair to add, has *erogationem* instead of *evacuationem*.

The word *intentator* (Jac. i. 13) is excessively harsh, and it will be impossible to find any word of that form that equals it, in the rudest writers. Yet it is impossible not to be struck with the number of strange compounds with the negative *in*, that occur in every page of Tertullian, and writers of that school. Thus we have in him, *imbonitas* (*adv. Martyr.* c. 3); *immisericordia* (*De. Spectac.* c. 20); *incriminatio* (*De Resur. Car.* c. 23); *ingratia* (*De Pœnit.* c. 1, 2); *insuavitas* (*ib.* c. 10); which is found also in Gellius (lib. i. c. 21, p. 107); *impræscientia* (*adv. Marcion.* lib. ii. c. 7); *illaudandus* (*ib.* lib. iii. c. 6); *invituperabilis* (lib. ii. c. 10, iv. 1); *incontradicibilis* (lib. iv. 59); *ininventibilis*, *ininvestigabilis* (*adv. Hermong.* c. 45): *innascibilis* (*De Præscript.* c. 49); *incontemptibilis* (*Apol.* c. 45); *illiberis* (*adv. Marc.* lib. iv. c. 34); *intestis* (*De Pallio.* c. 3, according to Salmasius's reading); found also in Arnobius (lib. v. p. 160); *investis* (*ad Uxor.* lib. ii. c. 9); *incommunis* (*De Pall.* c. 3); *inunitus* (*adv. Valent.* c. 29);

read also in Apuleius; *inemeribilis* (*De Resur.* c. 18); Lactantius also has *illibabilis* (lib. ii. c. 2); Arnobius *incontiguus* (lib. i. p. 7); and other peculiar words of that form. A. Gellius, too, peculiarly delights in this form; as may be seen from the catalogue, imperfect as it is, of words peculiar to him, given by Fabricius on Censorinus. (*Biblioth. Lat.* Lips. 1774, tom. iii. p. 77.) Apuleius, too, an African writer, and occasionally agreeing in the use of words with Tertullian, has often this form. Indeed the phrase most nearly approaching that of the Vulgate, "Deus enim intentator malorum est," is one of Apuleius, where he calls God "malorum improbator." (*De Deo Socr.* Lug. Bat. 1823, tom ii. p. 156.) This word *improbator* is likewise found in Tertullian (*De Patient.* c. 5).

I will now give a few examples of grammatical construction, which seem to indicate an African origin.

The verb *dominor* is almost always construed with a genitive; as, for instance, Ps. x. 5; xxi. 29; Luc. xxii. 25, etc.; and so has passed even into the new Vulgate. This construction is found only, as far as I know, in African writers. Thus Tertullian has, "nunquam *dominaturi ejus*, si Deo non deliquisset." (*Apol.* c. 26.)

Ps. xxxvi. 1, we have *zelare* with an accusative case; so Ecclus. ix. 1, 16; and in other places. St. Jerome has used the form twice, though he generally says, *zelatus sum pro.* This construction, likewise, is confined to African authors. Thus the author of the poem against Marcion, whether it be Tertullian, or St. Cyprian, has (*Carm. adv. Marc.* lib. iv. v. 36, in *Opp. Tertul.* Rigalt. p. 636)—

> "Qui *zelat populum* summo pietatis amore."

So likewise St. Augustine (*De Civit. Dei*, lib. iii. c. 3): "Dii credo non *zelant conjuges* suas." And again, *cont. Faust.* lib. xxii. c. 79.

The use of an *active* or *passive* infinite after *facio* is a harsh form of expression; as, Matt. iv. 19: "Facian vos fieri piscatores hominum." Acts viii. 45: "Figuras quas fecistis adorare." Among the classics this construction is hardly to be seen, unless *facio* signifies to *imagine* or *suppose;* as Cicero: "Plato construi a Deo atque ædificari mundum facit." (*De Nat. Deor.* lib. i. c. 8.) Arnobius, however, often uses this rude form; as, "Fecit oppidum claudi." Lib. v. p. 159.) "Fecit sumere habitum priorem." (*Ib.* p. 174.)

Jo. xix. 10: "Potestatem habeo crucifigere te, et potestatem habeo dimittere te." The poets do, indeed, use the infinitive after *potestas;* as Lucan (*Phars.* lib. ii. 40)—

> . . . . "Nunc *flere potestas*
> Quum pendet fortuna ducum."

and Statius (*Theb.* lib. iv. 249)—

> "Neque enim hæc juveni foret *ire potestas.*"

Yet even these poetical turns cannot be compared with the words quoted from the Vulgate: as in them the verbs are not used actively after the word *potestas*, which is thus, in a manner, equivalent to the impersonal *licet*. Victorinus however, the African writer already quoted, has the expression, "*potestas dare vivere*." (*Apud Mai, præf. ad Script. Vet.* p. xvii.)

Ps. xliv. 14, we have the expression *ab intus*. This is likewise found in a commentary on St. Luke, published by Monsignor Mai (*ib.* p. 192), the latinity of which seems to indicate an African origin.

Enallage of tenses often occurs in the old version. Thus the imperfect subjunctive is put for the pluperfect, as Acts ii. 1:—"Cum complerentur dies Pentecostes," for *completi essent*. Many other examples might be brought. I will quote a note of Heraldus upon the following words of Arnobius: "Nunquam rebus ejusmodi credulitatis suæ commodarent assensum." (Lib. i. p. 33.) His annotator writes thus:—"Afri utuntur sæpissime præterito imperfecto pro plusquam per fecto, ut loquuntur grammatici. Extat hæc ἐναλλαγὴ apud Arnobium et Tertullianum, locis quamplurimis; quin et apud antiquos scriptores, ut apud Plautum non raro. Hinc igitur Augustini celebre dictum illud 'Non crederem Evangelio, nisi me Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas.' Id est, *non credidissem*, tum quum eram Manichæus. Sic hoc loco *commodarent* pro *commodassent*." (*Desid. Heraldi Animadvers. ad Arnob.* lib. i. p. 54.)

I will give the judgment of the same learned critic upon another construction not unfrequent in our Vulgate,—a sudden change from an indirect construction to the infinitive. For instance (Luc. i. 72):—"*Ad faciendam misericordiam* cum patribus nostris, et *memorari* testamenti sui sancti." Arnobius has (lib. ii. p. 64), "Illibatum necesse est *permaneat* et intactum, neque ullum sensum mortiferæ passionis *assumere*." On these words his commentator observes:—"Proba lectio. Nam qui scribendum existimant, *assumat*, plane falluntur. His modorum mutationibus delectantur Afri scriptores. Infra; 'causam convenit *ut inspiciatis*, non factum, nec quid reliquerimus *opponere*.'" (*Ib.* p. 83.) I may observe that the change of moods I have cited from the Vulgate was manifestly the result of the translator's taste, and noways suggested by the original, which preserves through the sentence a consistent construction: ποιῆσαι ἔλεος . . . . καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης.

Perhaps some will not consider the preceding inquiry into the origin of the Vulgate sufficiently extensive to prove definitively that it was composed in Africa. I will, however, observe, that the best writers upon the Latin language agree in considering the African authors as composing a peculiar family, distinct from those of other nations. Thus, for instance, Walchius says:—"Afri propria dicendi ratione Latinum sermonem omnino corruperunt, constat id idem de Tertulliano, Cypriano, Arnobio, aliisque."* Now I doubt whether it would be possible to bring as many definite points of resemblance between any two African writers, as I have brought to show the similarity of words and constructions between the Vulgate and Tertullian, or Arnobius. And if it be said that the classification of these writers has been suggested more by the general features of their style and the rudeness of their diction than by marked approximations of phraseology, I would reply that the resemblance of style, for example, between Arnobius and St. Cyprian, is by no means so decisive as to warrant their being so associated; and that even in this view, the Vulgate, taking into account that it is only a translation, may well enter into the same class. To me, this investigation has brought complete conviction that the version was made in Africa; and that Tertullian is the author nearest to it in age and country.

---

* Johannis Georgii Walchii Historia critica Latinæ Linguæ. Ed. nova. *Lips.* 1729, p. 188.

And in the foregoing discussion I have laid before my readers the strongest proof, to which I alluded in my first letter,* that the version used throughout the Western Church was one in origin, however subsequently modified. For in the quotations of all the Fathers, whether Italian, Gaulish, or Spanish, we find these extraordinary words. If each Church used a different version, still more if every one who thought himself qualified, presumed to translate, is it credible, nay, is it possible, that all, of whatever country, of whatever abilities or education, would have used the same words, and adopted similar forms, and these most unusual, found only in writers of one province, some in no writer except these several versions? Can any one believe, for instance, that the verbs, *glorifico*, *clarifico*, *salvifico*, *magnifico*, *justifico*, *mortifico*, *vivifico*, should have been invented or adopted by a variety of authors translating independently, when we consider that they are to be found in no Italian author before the Vulgate came into general use? Why did no one among the supposed innumerable translators say *justum reddere*, *vitam dare*, or use any other such phrase. Only one solution, it seems, can be given to these queries; to suppose the version to have been the production of one man, or of several in the same country and age, who gave to it that uniform character and color which it has in all the fragments we possess of it.

---

* See. p. 27.

But in one respect I fear I may have been too diffuse; for I feel that I have once more to lead back my reader to the point whence this digressive inquiry started. I had endeavored to reduce the question of the authority of the Latin Fathers in favor of 1 John v. 7, to one of recensions. This led me into the investigation of the origin of the Vulgate; which being a point hitherto untouched, and of importance to the general interest of biblical criticism, I have carried on at a length more becoming a separate treatise than a digression. The result is, that Africa was the birth-place of the Vulgate, and consequently the African recension represents its oldest type, and is far superior in authority to the Italian. Thus it gives us the assurance that in the primary translation the verse existed; and that, if the Italian Fathers had it not, it was from its having been lost in their recension. We are thus led to conclude that the manuscripts used in making this version possessed the verse; and these were necessarily manuscripts of far greater antiquity than any we can now inspect.

And now, having had so frequently to refer to Tertullian, I will venture to observe, that justice has not been done to the passage commonly quoted from him, as a reference to our text. (*Adv. Prax.* c. 25.) To see the full force of his expression, we must read further till we come to the following words: "Nam et Spiritus substantia est Sermonis, et Sermo operatio Spiritus, *et duo unum sunt*." Tertullian certainly does not here refer to the passage he has already discussed so fully,—"ego et Pater unum sumus;" for it could never prove that the Son and Holy Ghost are one God. Yet he seems to allude to some text of equal force, where *the Word* and *the Spirit* are mentioned as being one; and this text can only be the one which he had already, in the passage commonly quoted, compared with that regarding the Father and the Son. He says, "*duo* unum sunt," because his argument, at that moment, required not the mention of all, and he was only alluding, not quoting. But I must hasten to my conclusion.

I promised only to give an account of some manuscripts found to contain the disputed verse of St. John; and in this I principally had in view the two Latin manuscripts, which I described in my first letter. I have, however, endeavored to connect the private evidence of one of my witnesses with the general mass of testimony in favor of the cause; and, I trust, proved that its weight is greater than its individual volume might seem to indicate. I have attempted, by this means, to place the favorable evidence upon a footing, of greater authority among critics, than that of dispersed testimonies, and removed some objections from the silence of St. Augustine, which used triumphantly to be urged against it. I will, however, detain my readers a few moments longer to make some observations upon Greek manuscripts said to contain the verse.

In the *Preface to the second edition of a Letter to Mrs. J. Baillie*, by the bishop of Salisbury, to which I cannot refer more particularly, as it was forwarded to me in a separate form by his lordship, mention is made of the evidence existing of a manuscript having once been seen at Venice, which contained the verse. It consists of the testimony of Harenberg, in the Bibliotheca Bremensis,* that a valuable Greek manuscript,—" auctoritatis non modicæ codicem Græcum,"—was shown by a Greek at Venice to F. Antoine. This was singularly confirmed by a marginal reference of one of the *Canonici MSS.* now in the Bodleian. A still more extraordinary coincidence was a third reference, which I discovered here (Rome), to a Greek manuscript at Venice. This I had briefly communicated to his lordship, who gave an extract from my letter, in an Appendix, on Sir Isaac Newton's suppression of his Dissertation on 1 John v. 7, etc., kindly forwarded to me on a separate sheet. I will now, however, state more at length the nature of this reference. In the Angelica Library, belonging to the Augustinians of this city, and so called from its founder, F. Angelo Rocca, is preserved the copy of the Bible used by him, as secretary of the Congregation appointed by Clement VII. for the correction of the Vulgate. It is the Roman edition of 1592, the second of Sixtus V. Prefixed to the volume are minutes of the acts of the Congregation; and on the margin are noted such passages as the secretary wished to submit to discussion, with the arguments, briefly stated, upon which he grounded the rejection, retention, or alteration, of each. Upon the text of St. John, p. 1114, is the following marginal annotation, written with numerous contractions:—"Hæc verba sunt certissime de textu et allegantur contra hæreticos ab Athanasio, Gregorio Nazianzeno, Cyrillo, et Cypriano; et Hieronymus in prologo dicit ab infidelibus scriptoribus fuisse prætermissa. *In Græco etiam quodam antiquissimo exemplari quod habetur Venetiis leguntur;* unde colligitur Græca, quæ passim feruntur, in hac parte esse mendosa, et omnia Latina manuscripta in quibus non habentur illa verba signata." This testimony, confirmed as it is by the two already cited, must be allowed considerable weight: the occasion, too, on which it is given, renders it still further worthy of our attention.

---

* Biblioth. Brem. Nova. *Brem.* 1762. Class. ii. p. 428.

I have now to mention the supposed existence of two manuscripts containing the verse, towards which I wish to turn the attention of critics and travellers. I had frequently heard from a gentleman, well known in the literary world as a Greek and oriental scholar, that he had seen manuscripts in the East which contained the verse. He had, in fact, travelled over a great part of Greece expressly with the view of collating manuscripts of the New Testament for a Latin version of it, which he afterwards published.* Anxious to collect with greater accuracy the information he had to give upon the subject, I asked him more particularly to state to me what he had seen in reference to it. I took a note of his observations within a few minutes of our conversation; and as more than a year has since elapsed, I will content myself with transcribing it here.

"His statement is, that he has seen several manuscripts with the verse erased, and two in which it is written, *prima manu*, in the margin. One was at Nicosia in Cyprus, in possession of a Greek, of abilities, a merchant, as I understood him. It was in uncial letters, large; on the margin, by the same hand, although in smaller characters, was the verse, with an annotation that it belonged to the text. From his manner and character, I could have no reason whatever to doubt that he was perfectly sincere in his statements." I will add no comment upon this testimony; perhaps some traveller may be able to verify it.

---

* This was Don Leopoldo Sebastiani since deceased.

There are several other points on which I should have been glad to touch, especially upon the objection frequently brought against the free discussion of this controversy from the decree of the Council of Trent. Some writers have given very false views of this subject, which it would be easy to confute, from the acts of the different congregations appointed to correct the text of the Vulgate. In one of these, the arguments for the rejection of 1 John v. 7, seem to have been seriously taken into consideration. In the Bible used by one of these congregations, now in the library of the Barnabite Fathers, the following note, by the secretary, is written in the margin:

"*in* grae. cod. vati. et
al. grae codd. necnon et
*in aliqu*ibus latinis non habentur
*ver*ba virgula signata."

The letters printed in italics are supplied, having been cut off in binding the volume. But a valuable and interesting account of the corrections of the Vulgate, almost entirely from inedited sources, may be shortly expected from the pen of my learned friend F. Ungarelli. Many errors on this subject will be then corrected. But while, from an unwillingness to prolong a letter already of unwieldy dimensions, I refrain from entering more fully upon this important discusssion, I cannot help cautioning my reader against the erroneous conclusions to which the work of a late learned Catholic seems to lead, that the decree of the Council of Trent and the critical evidence stand in direct opposition. He observes that "Here the communicant with the See of Rome takes a higher ground . . . . those, therefore, in communion with the See of Rome, who now reject the verse, fall within the Council's anathema."* The answers to this objection are urged with little strength or feeling of interest, yet the whole of the dissertation is so constructed as to prove, that on critical grounds, the verse has to be rejected! Such an opposition cannot, and here certainly does not, exist. I remain, etc.,

N. Wiseman.

English College, Rome, March 27, 1833.

---

* Horæ Biblicæ. *Lond.* 1817. Appendix, p. 383.

CATHOLIC VERSIONS

OF

SCRIPTURE.

[From the *Dublin Review* for April, 1837.]

Art. IX.—*A new Version of the Four Gospels, with Notes, Critical and Explanatory.* By a Catholic.* London, 1836.

The appearance of any work upon biblical literature is, unfortunately, a phenomenon among us. Whether this branch of theological science be cultivated as it deserves by the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, it might be deemed presumption in us to discuss; but of the manifestation, by its fruits, of such a study, we cannot avoid being cognizant. What is done in the seclusion of academical life, in the cloisters of our religious establishments, or in the rural solitude of our clergy, may be much more than falls under the public notice; the appearance of a work like the one that heads this article, shows that considerable abilities are, in secret, employed upon biblical pursuits, and must check the hasty conclusion, that little is done, because little appears. At the same time, the sudden and unannounced publication of a new version of Scripture was not the earliest indication which we should have expected of increased attention to these studies. We are utterly unprovided with even elementary and introductory works upon them, whether intended for the education of our clergy, or for the instruction of our people; we possess not a commentary suited to the wants of the times, or the advances made in biblical science; and are obliged to seek information either in voluminous, rare, and old writers, or in the productions of men whose religion differs essentially from ours. And even in this last resource, we have but scanty measure of relief. Protestant England is almost as badly provided as ourselves with works of practical usefulness; and it would seem as though water were as bad a conductor of knowledge as it is of electricity; for the narrow strip of it which girds our islands, most effectually precludes all communication of the various and interesting researches which occupy the continent.

---

* It is now well known that this work is from the pen of Dr. Lingard.

But the indication of attention to biblical learning, which we should most confidently have expected to find preceding any new version of Scripture, and we will add, the proof of its existence which is most imperatively called for, is a revision and correction of that version now in use among Catholics, known by the name of the *Douay version.* We do not suppose that the learned author of the new translation for a moment imagined or intended that it should supersede the one now in general circulation. The sanctioned authenticity of the Vulgate, its use in all Catholic churches, the hold which it has upon the memory of clergy and laity, then the confined and partial nature of the new version, which comprises only the Gospels, and the form in which it appears, are sufficient proofs that he never entertained the idea. The correspondence between St. Jerome and St. Augustine, upon the difficulties encountered in introducing the translation of the former, instead of the old one made from the Septuagint, shows how little practicable such substitutions are. We make these remarks only to conclude, that, whatever necessity existed, before the appearance of this version, for a thorough revision of the text generally used among us, the same necessity does still exist. While, therefore, we are ready to commend the zeal and ability which have led to this publication, we cannot but regret that no one properly qualified, and properly authorized, has yet been found to undertake such corrections and improvements in our received version as would finally settle its text, and save it from the repeated liberties which have been taken with it.

To call it any longer the Douay or Rheimish version is an abuse of terms. It has been altered and modified till scarcely any verse remains as it was originally published; and so far as simplicity and energy of style are concerned, the changes are in general for the worse. For though Dr. Challoner did well to alter many too decided Latinisms, which the old translators had retained, he weakened the language considerably by destroying inversion, where it was congenial, at once, to the genius of our language and to the construction of the original, and by the insertion of particles where they were by no means necessary. Any chapter of the New Testament will substantiate this remark. For instance, in Heb. xiii, which we have accidentally opened, the Rheims edition (1582) has, v. 9, "With various and strange doctrines be not led away." This has been altered into, "Be not carried away with various and strange doctrines." The Latin is, "Doctrinis variis et peregrinis nolite abduci." Again, v. 16, "Beneficence and communication do not forget," has been changed into, "And do not forget to do good and to impart." The Vulgate has, "Beneficentiæ autem et communionis nolite oblivisci." Again, we take examples quite at random, 2 Tim. ii. 16: "Profana autem et vaniloquia devita; multum enim proficiunt ad impietatem." This the old version translated, "But profane and vain speeches avoid; for they do much grow to impiety." In the emended edition (1750) we have, "But shun profane and vain babblings, for they grow much towards ungodliness." This correction is taken verbatim from the Protestant version, with the exception of "grow towards," instead of "increase unto more." But the change was injudicious: for the Latin compound *vaniloquium*, or the Greek κενοφωνία, is exactly expressed by "vain speech;" whereas the word "babbling" corresponds to the entire word, and cannot have the epithet "vain;" for, thus, the phrase would represent the absurd tautology "vanum vaniloquium." In later editions, as that of Dublin, 1810, published with Dr. Troy's approbation, the word "speeches" is restored, but the construction is not.

There is another alteration of more importance, especially when considered in reference to the present times, and the influence it has had upon established forms of Catholic speech. In the first edition, in conformity to Catholic usage in England, the word "Dominus" is almost always translated by "*Our* Lord." The emended text changed the pronoun into an article, and says, "*The* Lord." In the *Ave Maria*, Catholics have always, till lately, been accustomed to say, "*Our* Lord is with thee:" as it is in that version, and as it was always used in England, even before that translation was made. But, in conformity with the change of the text, we have observed of late a tendency to introduce into the prayer a similar variation, and to say, "*The* Lord is with thee;" a change which we strongly deprecate, as stiff, *cantish*, destructive of the unction which the prayer breathes, and of that union which the pronoun inspires between the reciter and Her who is addressed. We have no hesitation in saying that this difference, trifling as many will consider it, expresses strongly the different spirits of our, and other, religions. It never has been the custom of the Catholic Church to say, "*The* Redeemer, *the* Saviour, *the* Lord, *the* Virgin;" "Redemptor *noster*, Dominus *noster*," and so "*our* Saviour, *our* Lord, *our* Lady," are the terms sanctioned; and, therefore, consecrated by Catholic usage since the time of the Fathers. We own it grates our ears, and jars upon our feelings, to hear the former essentially un-Catholic forms used by preachers and writers; they want affection; they are insipid, formal; they remind us of Geneva caps, and smack of predestination. The Rheims translators have explained their reason for their translation in a note, p. 585, as follows: "We Catholics must not say *The Lord*, but *Our Lord*; as we say *Our Lady* for his mother, not *The Lady*. Let us keep our forefathers' words, and we shall easily keep our old and true faith, which we had of the first Christians." Nor is such a modification of the word "Dominus" peculiar to the English Catholics; the Syriac version, and, after it, the Syriac Church, calls Christ, not simply ܡܳܪܝܐ *morio*, "*The* Lord," but ܡܪܢ *moran*, "*our* Lord," even where the Greek has ὁ Κύριος. If, therefore, it be considered too great a departure from accuracy in translation to restore the pronoun in the text of our version, let us at least preserve it in our instructions, and still more in our formularies of prayer.

But it had been well if Dr. Challoner's alterations had given stability to the text, and formed a standard to which subsequent editors had conformed. But, far from this being the case, new and often important modifications have been made in every edition which has followed, till at length many may appear rather new versions, than revisions of the old. We believe Catholic Britain to be the only country where such a laxity of attention has existed in regard to the purity of its authorized version.* And we should have even less reason to complain, had these systematic variations been the only vicissitudes to which it has been subject. The mass of typographical errors to be found in some editions is quite frightful, from many of them falling upon important words, and not so much disfiguring them, which would lead to suspicion and thereby to detection, as transforming them into others that give a correct grammatical, but unsound theological, sense. In 1632, the king's printers, Barker and Lucas, were fined £3,000, for the omission of one monosyllable; and the Oxford Bible of 1792 is considered a curiosity because it reads (Luke xxii. 34) *Philip* instead of *Peter*. But, in the edition which we have referrred to,—of Dublin, 1810,—revised under Dr. Troy's direction by the Rev.

---

* We have not forgotten the Rev. Mr. Curtis's late Letter to the bishop of London.

B. MacMahon, many worse substitutions are to be found. A table at the end gives a number of them, as Matt. xvi. 23, "thou *favourest* not," for "thou *savourest* not;" and Romans vii. 18, "to accomplish that which is good I find *out*," instead of "I find *not*." The table of errata is, however, very far from complete; for instance, the following among others are omitted in it: Gal. iv. 9, "How turn you again to the *work*" (for *weak*) "and poor elements." Ib. v. 23, "modesty, continency, *charity*," instead of "*chastity*." In a note, p. 309, we read, "Sin—which was asleep before, was *weakened* by the prohibition," instead of "*awakened*."

Our principal object, however, at present, is to turn the attention of the Catholic clergy, and particularly the bishops of Ireland, and the vicars-apostolic of England and Scotland, to the want of a complete revision of the version itself, for the purpose of settling a standard text, from which editors in future may not be allowed to depart. In this manner, alone, will the Catholics of the empire be provided with what every other portion of the Church has long since possessed. It is far from our purpose to undertake a complete exposure of the many passages which want emendation—such a task would require a treatise. In order to confine ourselves within reasonable limits, we will only consider the necessity which a new revision would impose on those who should undertake it, of a minute and often complicated study of the original texts. We have selected this view of the matter, because we think it the point most neglected in the past, and most likely to be overlooked, and to form the great stumbling-block, in any future revision. For, at first sight it must appear an almost superfluous task to proceed, in such an undertaking, beyond the accurate study of the work immediately translated. The Vulgate is written in Latin, and it would therefore appear sufficient to possess an accurate knowledge of the Latin language, in order to translate any work written in it into our own. It is our wish to prove the fallacy of such reasoning; and, on the contrary, to show what varied, and often delicate, questions of philology the translation may involve; and how impossible it is to correct or discover the mistakes of our Douay version, without a constant recourse to the original Hebrew and Greek texts. The object of such reference will be to decide the true meaning of expressions, obscure or doubtful, in the Latin. In the few examples which we intend to give, we shall consider the Alexandrine, or, as it is commonly called, the Septuagint, version, as the original of the Psalms; because it is well known that the Latin used by us, and inserted in the Vulgate, is made upon that version, and not on the Hebrew original.

I.—Let us select, in the first instance, a very simple example. In the fiftieth Psalm, v. 14 (Heb. li. 14), the Vulgate has, "et spiritu *principali* confirma me." The Douay translators understood the adjective in the sense of *principal*, *excellent*, and accordingly translated the sentence thus: "and strengthen me with a *perfect* spirit." Looking simply at the Latin, the word will certainly bear that sense; as Cicero says, "Causarum aliæ sunt *perfectæ* et *principales*." But the question here is, did the author of the Vulgate use the word in this sense, and not rather in its other meaning, of princely? A reference to the Greek, from which the translation of this book was made, decides the question. For there we read, *πνεύματι ἡγεμονικῷ στήριξόν με*,—"strengthen me with a *princely spirit*." In the Hebrew the word used is נריבה which bears the same meaning, though it also derivatively signifies "generous," "noble."*

II.—Wisdom viii. 21, we have the following sentence: "And as I knew that I could not otherwise be *continent*, except God gave it." This is a verbal translation of the Latin, "Et ut scivi quoniam aliter non possem esse *continens* nisi Deus det." The word *continens* corresponds to to the Greek *ἐγκρατής*, here as in every other passage wherein it occurs through the sapiential books, and is never, save in this passage, rendered in our version by *continent*. This point is easily established. Eccles. vi. 28, we have the same subject, the acquisition of wisdom, treated as in our text, in these words: "Investiga illam, et manifestabitur tibi, et *continens factus*, ne derelinquas eam." Our translators did not render these words, by "being made *continent*," but by "when thou *hast gotten* her." The Greek has καὶ εγκρατης γενομενος (v. 27, ed. Bos). These words occur in two other places, where, however, there is no ellipsis, but the object is expressed:—xv. 1, "Qui *continens* est justitiæ apprehendet illam;" translated, "he that *possesseth* justice shall lay hold on her." And xxvii. 33, "Ira et furor utraque execrabilia sunt, et vir peccator *continens* illorum erit;" rendered, "and the sinful man shall *be subject* to them;" that is shall *contain* or *possess* them. This last example proves that *continens*, or εγκρατης, does not signify "qui *se* continet,"—one who *restrains* himself, but one who contains or holds something else; and the first instance quoted proves that it is so used elliptically, with omission of the object so held or contained.

---

* Perhaps the old word "lordly" would best express the double meaning, as its corresponding term *herrlich* would in German.

These are the only other passages, if we mistake not, in which the Latin word occurs as an equivalent to the cited Greek one throughout these books. We may next ask, Ought a deviation to have been made from the meaning they elsewhere invariably bear, in Sap. viii. 21? And we answer, unhesitatingly, not. The entire passage is concerning the acquisition of wisdom. From verse 9 to verse 19, the writer gives us an account of his searches after it. In vv. 19, 20, he states the causes that led him to them; first, his having been gifted with an ingenuous disposition; and secondly, his having preserved himself from sin. The verse under consideration naturally follows: "And as I knew that I could not otherwise *possess it* (wisdom), unless God gave it (for this was also a point of wisdom, to know whose gift it was), I went to the Lord," etc. But if we read with our present version, "as I knew I could not *be continent*," etc., we have to meet multiplied difficulties. First, that not a word has been said about continence, but the whole antecedent matter has been concerning wisdom; secondly, that the parenthesis makes no sense, for the thing there mentioned as a gift cannot be continence, as *it* must refer to a substantive, and not an adjective, such as *continent;* and, moreover, its antithesis is lost,—"it was a point of wisdom to know whose gift *wisdom* is;" thirdly, that the prayer which follows, for the quality in question, is entirely for wisdom, and not for continence, which is never asked for. These reasons are more than sufficient for retaining, in this passage, the sense invariably attributed to *continens* in every other.

III.—Ps. lxvii. 12, presents an instance in which an ambiguity of phrase compels us to recur, not only to the Greek, but, beyond this, to the original Hebrew. The Latin text runs thus: "Dominus dabit verbum evangelizantibus, *virtute multa;*" and is thus translated in the Douay version: "The Lord shall give the word to them that preach good tidings, *in great power*." The word *virtus* is manifestly ambiguous, as it often signifies a *host*, or *multitude*. Hence the common phrase, "Dominus virtutum," is always rendered "the Lord of Hosts;" and "virtutes cœlorum," "the host of heaven." It became, therefore, the translator's duty to recur to the Greek; where he would find the words, δυναμει πολλη. But here the same ambiguity exists. For the word δυναμις often indeed corresponds to terms significative in Hebrew of strength, as כח,* גבורה,† צין ‡ and the derivations of עזי,§ but it almost as frequently corresponds to words of multitude, as עם a people,‖ המון a multitude,¶ מחנה a camp,() חיל an army,[] and, above all, to צבא, the most usual word for a collection of men, or a host. As the equivalent of this word δυναμις occurs some hundreds of times in the Bible, and one of the occasions is the very passage under discussion; for the Hebrew text, lxviii. 12, reads צבא רב. Thus, no doubt remains that the ambiguous Greek word δυναμις here stands for "multitude" or "crowds;" and this again determines the signification of the no less ambiguous Latin term "virtus."

---

* 1 Chron. xxix. 2; Es. ii. 69; Jer. xlviii. 45.

† Jud. viii. 21; 2 Reg. xviii. 10, etc.

‡ Job xl. 11.

§ Job. xli. 14; Ps. xx. 1; xlv. 1.

‖ 1 Chron. xxi. 2.

¶ 2 Sam. vi. 19; 1. Reg. xx. 28; Jer. iii. 23.

() 1 Chron. xii. 22.

[] This Hebrew word is ambiguous as the Greek and Latin ones in the text; but constantly means an army, as Exod. xiv. 28.

All this investigation was absolutely necessary for the translator, before he could make sure of rightly rendering so simple a word; and the use of the adjective *multa* might have led him to suspect that number, and not strength, was contemplated. This verse would afford us room for several other curious philological remarks in illustration of our subject; but for brevity's sake we pass them over. We need hardly observe, that it alludes to the custom frequently mentioned in Scripture,* and practised by other eastern nations besides the Jews,† of female choirs coming forth to celebrate the conquerors on their return from battle. The word corresponding in the original to "evangelizantibus" is in the Hebrew in the plural feminine, and this could hardly bear the present translation, "them that *preach* good tidings." The word *proclaim* would have suited better.

IV.—We now call the attention of our biblical readers to a very curious rendering in the Vulgate, which seems to us to have been misunderstood by our translators, in consequence of not having attended to the original. This is Sophon.

---

* See Exod. xv. 20: Jud. xi. 34; 1 Sam. xviii. 6, 7: 2, Sam. i. 20.

† See, for instance, the account of the mountaineers of Tiproa, by J. Rawlins, Esq., in the Asiatic Researches, vol. ii. *Lond.* 1799, p. 191.

iii. 18, where the Hebrew has as follows: ממך היו נוגי ממועד אספתי. The Vulgate translates thus: "*Nugas* qui a lege recesserunt, congregabo, quia ex te erant;" and is rendered thus by the Douay editors: "the *triflers* that were departed from the law I will gather together, because they were of thee." It must be noticed that the Latin word *nugæ* purposely corresponds to the Hebrew word נוגי, *nughe.* This is a passive participle of the verb יגה, and means "afflicted;"* though some lexicographers prefer the meaning of "removed," which occurs in the root, and is given by the Greek version, and some Jewish commentators.† Now the rendering of St. Jerome strikes out a totally different signification, whether we translate it by "trifles" or "triflers." But there is an old meaning of the word *nugæ*, which would exactly agree with the first of those we have mentioned. In plautus, it means a "*lamentation*," the *nænia*, or mourning song of the *præfica;* and this is allowed to be probably the oldest meaning of the word. Hence, by a synecdoche, it might be used for a "mourner," as it is used for a "trifler." The question, therefore, which a translator of the Vulgate would have to ask himself would be, Can St. Jerome in this passage have used the word *nugas* in that older sense? And we should certainly be inclined to answer it affirmatively, on the following grounds:

---

* See Winer's Lexicon Manuale, p. 396.

† Rosenmüller's Prophetæ Minores. *Lips.* 1816. Vol. iv. p. 68.

1. St. Jerome, in his commentary, seems indifferent which interpretation we take,—his own, or Aquila's. "*Nugas*, sive ut Aquila interpretatus est, *translatos* qui a te recesserunt congregabo."* If he had used the word in the ordinary sense, the two versions could not for an instant have been compared. But the *sorrowful* and the *banished* are words whose meanings may be easily exchanged, as they are intimately connected by cause and effect.

2. Any one that has studied the version and commentaries of this Father must have seen their constant accordance with the traditions and opinions of the Jews; and were it necessary for us to illustrate this point by examples, we could do it by many passages in his notes upon the very book of minor prophets now under consideration. But, in fact, he tells us himself that in difficult passages he made it a point to follow his Jewish masters.† Now the Jewish interpreters and commentators give two meanings to the word. The Targum, or Chaldaic paraphrase, and R. Solomon Jarchi, render it in the same manner as Aquila, approved by St. Jerome,—"the removed;" Kimchi, and most others, give the other meaning, "the sorrow-

---

* Comment. *in loc.*

† "Hæc dico ut noveris quos in Prophetæ hujus campo habuerim præcursores, quos tamen . . . non in omnibus sum secutus, ut judex potius operis eorum quam interpres existerem, diceremque quid mihi videretur in singulis, *et quid ab Hebræorum magistris acceperim.*"

ful;" and the Gemara, an old comment upon the Babylonish Talmud, shows them both to have been maintained by the ancient Jewish teachers, inasmuch as it attributes the one to R. Joshua, and the other to R. Eleazar.* Supposing "nugæ" to have been used by St. Jerome in its less ordinary sense, we find him approving of exactly the two interpretations which his avowed teachers would have delivered to him, and hesitating which to choose. But if the word mean "trifles" or "triflers," it is impossible to account for the source whence he derived his interpretation, not deducible from the Hebrew root, unknown to every other biblical writer, and not taught him by those on whose authority in such points he relied.

3. St. Jerome, in his commentary, makes an apology, and gives a reason for having used this word: "Id quod diximus *nugas* sciamus in Hebræo ipsum Latinum esse sermonem, ut propterea a nobis ita ut in Hebræo erat positum, ut nosse possimus linguam Hebræam omnium linguarum esse matricem." This reasoning supposes that he had gone out of his way to select this word, which certainly would not have been the case, had he used it in its ordinary acceptation. On the other hand, we cannot suspect him of having sacrificed the sense to a mere resemblance between the Hebrew and Latin words. We must,

---

* Cod. Beracha, cap. iv. fol. 28.

therefore, conclude that the word *nugæ* is here used in a rarer sense, but one which suits the meaning of the original; and the result of these reflections seems to be, that this word in the passage is to be rendered by *sorrowful* or *mourners*, a signification at once allied to the version of Aquila, given by the Rabbins, and accounting for St. Jerome's excuses.

V.—It is singular that St. Jerome should translate on every occasion except two, the Hebrew word and its derivatives, by *calumniari* or its substantives. Yet this Hebrew verb is admitted by all to signify *oppression* or *violence*, sometimes perhaps, with an addition of *fraud*. The translator of the Vulgate must, therefore, inquire whether St. Jerome really meant the word *calumniari* to be taken in the sense in which it is usually taken, or whether it bears in his version the peculiar signification of *violence*. If the former were the case, he *must* translate it by *calumny*, however this may differ from the original, since the translator's duty is only to present a faithful transcript of the Latin version. But if St. Jerome used it in the second sense, then the word *calumny* cannot be used, because it never bears with us the signification of *violence*. It is impossible to conceive that this learned Father could have used these terms in their ordinary acceptation, for they are often placed where the context will not admit of any signification but that of *violence* or *oppression*. Thus they are used in apposition with terms of unjust oppression,* they are spoken of whole nations, which certainly could not well be said to be an object of calumny or false accusation.† The translator would therefore decide that the word *calumnia* and its derivatives in the Vulgate, signify oppression. Yet this is not universally the case, but only when it corresponds to the Hebrew עשק or its nouns. For example, Gen. xliii. 18, we have the words, "ut devolvat in nos *calumniam*; yet as the Hebrew verb there is not עשק but להתגלל, we must translate the word by a *false accusation*. It is only, therefore, by having the original open before us that we could ascertain when the word was to be translated *violence* or *oppression*, or when *calumny*, or *false accusation*. The Douay translators have indeed generally been right in their rendering of this word, because the context is generally such as to force us to a correct interpretation; but where this did not lead them, they have failed, and so have left the work unfinished. Thus, Gen. xxvi. 20; Levit. xix. 30; Prov. xxviii. 16; Ezek. xxii. 29; and Job x. 3, our version presents the word *calumny*.[*] The last of these passages is remarkable, for Job is there said to upbraid God with *calumniating* him, when it is evident, from the circumstances of his history, as well as from the context, and the general tenor of his complaints, that harsh and oppressive treatment was what he objected to the conduct of the Almighty in his regard. Yet in all these passages the same word עשק occurs in the original; and as we have seen already that St. Jerome understood this word of oppression, though he rendered it by *calumniari*, it is clear that in all these passages he meant this to have that meaning; and so it should have been rendered by our translators.

---

* Deut. xxviii. 29. 33; Eccles. v. 7; Jer. vii. 6; Ezek. xxii. 29; Amos iv. 1. Two remarkable examples are Jer. xxii. 3: "Liberate *vi oppressum* de manu *calumniatoris*;' and xxi. 12, where nearly the same words occur.

† Jer. i. 33; Osee v. 11. But see particularly 1 Kings (or Sam.) xii. 4, where the people say to Samuel, upon his retiring from government, " Non *es calumniatus* nos."

Only one thing would be wanting to make this reasoning satisfactory, and that is, to prove that the Latin word *calumnia* really has this meaning of oppression, or perhaps more properly of *vexation*. The Lexicons do not, it is true, present a signification sufficiently strong: the one, for instance, which approaches nearest in Forcellini,[†] is No. 6, "Sumitur etiam latius pro quacunque vitiosa callidatate, astutia, vexatione." Craft, however, and not oppression, is here the essential ingredient, and all the examples brought show that he understands it only of vexatious, petty, proceedings in law. From this it would appear that our translators were led only by the force of the context to select the extraordinary, but correct, interpretation which they have generally given. But it seems to us that this word easily passed from its forensic use to a wider signification of oppression in acts; especially when under *the sanction of law*, which we apprehend to be the most ordinary use of עשׁק. Hence this might be accurately rendered by *calumniari* in Latin. We think the following authority may justify this assertion. Under Domitian, and other cruel emperors, a heavy tax was imposed upon all Jews and was exacted with peculiar rigor, and even cruelty. Suetonius thus writes of the Emperor we have named: "Præter cæteros, Judaicus fiscus acerbissime exactus est."* Under Nerva, the odious imposition was abolished, and a medal remains to commemorate the event. It bears this legend:—

---

[*] Isa. liv. 14, the first edition of our version, Douay, 1609–10, has *calumny*; the modern correction, *oppression*.

[†] Sub voce *calumnia*, tom. i. p. 450. col. i. *Patav.* 1827.

FISCI. IVDAICI. CALVMNIA. SVBLATA.†

Here the word *calumnia* evidently signifies "tyranny," or "oppression," and will fully justify the use of the word in this sense in the Vulgate, and consequently the translation which we suggest.

We cannot take leave of this word without recalling to our reader's notice another remarkable text where it occurs. We allude to Luke iii. 14. The Baptist is there giving instructions to soldiers, on campaign,* what they are to do. He suggests three points to their observance: the *first* is to do violence to no man; the *third*, to be content with their pay. These two points are not only in accordance with the profession and habits of the persons instructed, but are also in perfect harmony the one with the other. The soldiers are not to enrich themselves by rapine, but to be satisfied with what they receive. We should expect the intermediate portion of advice to be of like character; it is, μηδὲ συκοφαντήσητε. This the Vulgate renders by *neque calumniam faciatis.* The Douay version again translates, "neither calumniate any man."† This is totally out of keeping with the context. The fact is that the verb συκοφαντέω in the Greek of the Septuagint means to *oppress*, and is frequently put for the Hebrew עשק‡ It had thus acquired that force in Jewish Greek, like so many other words,‖ and should be so rendered. This has been already noticed by writers on the Greek of the New Testament.*

---

* Domit. c. xii. tom. ii. p. 328, edit. Burm.

† Eckhel, Doctrina Num. Vet. tom. vi. p. 404. From the Imperial Cabinet of Vienna.

---

* This circumstance is of importance for the rendering, of the text. The word is στρατευμενοι. See Michaelis, Marsh's transl. tom. i. p. 51.

† The English authorized version has nearly the same,—"Neither accuse any man falsely."

‡ Job xxxv. 9; Psalm clxviii. 121; Proverbs xiv. 33; xxii. 16; xxviii. 3; Eccles. iv. 1.

‖ It is an admitted principle in Hermeneutics, that the Greek of the Seventy is one of the great keys to the right interpretation of the Greek of the New Testament. See Arigler, Hermeneutica Biblica Generalis. *Vienna*, 1813, p. 103.

VI.—We shall, perhaps, require still more indulgence from our readers for our observations on another passage from the Old Testament. Ps. xxxix. 9 (in the Septuagint), the Greek version has *σωμα δε κατηρτισω μοι*, "thou hast fitted a body to me." The Latin version of the Psalms, as we have before observed, is made from this Greek translation, and yet in this passage it has "aures autem perfecisti mihi," which the Douay version no less singularly renders, "thou hast *pierced* ears for me." For the verb "perficio" certainly never bore this signification in any ancient writer. At first sight, it would appear as though the Vulgate, particularly if we admit the correctness of the English rendering, had in this verse been taken from the Hebrew, which has אזנים כרית לי "aures perforasti mihi." Before, therefore, censuring the Douay rendering, and consequently showing the necessity of recourse to the original texts, we must prove that the Vulgate in this verse is not made upon the Hebrew, which it seems to resemble, but on the Septuagint, to which it bears so little affinity.

A slight comparison of the entire Psalm, in the Vulgate, with the two texts, will satisfy the most superficial scholar that every other verse is translated from the Greek; and this affords us a strong presumption that this passage was derived from the same source. The principal difficulty resides in the substitution of *aures*, "ears," for σωμα, "body." But this change is easily accounted for in two ways. First, several copies of the Septuagint read ωτια, "ears," instead of σωμα. In Parsons's continuation of Holmes's critical edition of that version, we have the following note upon the passage, "Σωμα δε] ωτια δε (Cod.) 39, ωτα δε, 142, 156 (292 marg)." * The same reading is given by Bos from a Greek commentary. The Vulgate, therefore, may have been made upon a manuscript which read thus; and in this supposition no objection exists to its having rendered this verse from the Greek. Secondly, it seems probable, that originally the Latin read "corpus," and not "aures;" and then there would be no discrepancy between it and the present Greek text.

---

* Vid. Schleusner sub voce *συκοφαντέω*. and Kuinoel *in loc*

The Mosarabic and Roman Psalters have it as well as St. Augustine, Cassiodorus, St. Ambrose, and St. Hilary.† The Veronese Psalter, published by Bianchini, presents the same reading.* The use of the verb "perfecisti" leaves little room to doubt that this was the original reading. The substantive and the verb agree perfectly; when, at a later period, the former was changed, the latter was allowed to remain, and did not suit so well.

---

* The MSS. here quoted are thus described in the Prolegomena to the work :—"39. Codex Dorothei, ii. Membr. soc. ix.—142. Bib. Aulier Vindob. Theol. x.; membr. pervet. optimæ notæ.—156. Bib. Basil. membr. 4 adm. antiq. sine accent. cum vers. lat. interlin.—292. Cod. Bib. Medic. num. iii. Plut. vi. opt. notæ membran. in fol. sæc. xi."

† Ap. Sabatier, Bibliorum Sacrorum Versiones Antiquæ, 1743.

The moment this difficulty is removed, and no doubt consequently remains that the verse is translated from the Septuagint, it is plain that "perfecisti" corresponds to κατηρτοσω. Now, this verb means sometimes in Scripture, "to complete, to perfect;" as for example, 1 Thess. iii. 10, where the Vulgate translates it "ut compleam;" and, therefore, no doubt, "perficio" is here used in this sense. The old Douay version has correctly "eares thou hast perfited to me," which was subsequently altered into its present reading. If this change was made in deference to the original Hebrew, a principle of translation was violated; for the Greek should have been consulted, and the Vulgate should not have been here abandoned for the Hebrew, any more than in a thousand other places where they differ.

---

* Psalter. duplex cum Canticis, p. 63. Published in his Vindiciæ Canonicarum Scripturarum Vulgatæ Latinæ editionis. *Rome*, 1740. In a note on this passage, he adds, "Favet utrique lectioni versio Arabica." This is a mistake, which, however, does not surprise us, as most that has been written on the Arabic version of the Psalms is very inaccurate. This however, is not the place to prove this point, and substitute more exact observations.

VII.—We will now notice a case which shows how the incautious insertion of the smallest monosyllable may totally alter the sense. It is the well-known passage, Jo. ii. 4—"Quid mihi et tibi mulier?" The old Rhemish editors of 1582 scrupulously rendered word for word, not without a sacrifice of clearness and propriety,—"*What is to me* and to thee woman?" In a note they explain their motives, grounded on the ambiguous character of the phrase, which they did not think it proper more definitely to express. In the correction by Dr. Challoner, this ambiguity was preserved; and, indeed, it yet remains in many modern editions. Some however, as that of Edinburgh, 1792, have slipped in "*it*," and read, "What is *it* to me and to thee?" But there can be no doubt that this translation is erroneous, and that for many reasons.

First, this form of expression, which occurs in our text, is very common in the Old Testament, and always means that there is no connection between the persons thus mentioned. It may be sufficient to consult the passages below in the margin.*

Secondly, it occurs very frequently in the classics, Greek and Latin, and bears invariably the same meaning. Thus Anacreon:—

---

* Jos. xxii. 24; Jud. xi. 12: 2 Sam. xvi. 10: 1 Reg. xvii. 18: 2 Reg. iii. 13: Mic. ii. 2. Cf. Glassius, Philologia. Sacra. *Leips.* 1776, tom. i. p. 491.

> Τί γὰρ μάχαισι κἀμοι.
>
> * * *
>
> Τί Πλειάδεσσι κἀμοι.*

Aulus Gellius quotes from Epictetus (lib. ii.) *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ ἄνθρωπε; ἀρκεῖ ἐμοὶ τὰ ἐμὰ κακὰ.*† Quintus Curtius has, in like manner, "Quid nobis tecum est;"‡ and Ovid,—

> "Quid mihi cum Siculis, inter Scythiamque Getasque?"‖

Martial writes thus: "Martialis Deciano suo S. Quid nobis inquis cum epistola? parumne tibi præstamus si legimus epigrammata?"§ We could add examples from Oriental writers. But what is most to be noted is, that the classics often fill up the ellipsis, by adding an adjective or substantive. Thus Philostratus, Σοὶ δὲ τί καὶ Προτεσίλεω κοινόν;¶ Propertius uses the word "gratia."

> "Cum Tiberi Nilo gratia nulla fuit."()

---

* Ode xvii. 264, 276.

† Noctes Atticæ, ed. Gronov. lib. i. c. ii. p. 37.

‡ Lib. viii. c. viii. § 16.

‖ Trist. lib. iii. eleg. xi. 54.

§ Introd. to lib. ii. Epig.

¶ Philost. Her. p. 8, ed. Boiss. In like manner, Schiller, Jungfrau von Orleans, act v. scene v. has—

> "Nicht kann *gemein* seyn
> Zwischen dir und mir."

() Lib. ii. eleg. xxxiii. 20.

And Claudian, "ratio."

> "Quæ tibi cum pedibus ratio? quid carmina culpas?
> Scandere qui nescis, versiculos laceras."*

The Persians, as, for instance, Firdausi, use the substantive *Kar*, "negotium."

Thirdly, in the New Testament, the phrase occurs several times besides this place, and manifestly has the same meaning. We will at present only notice the message to Pilate from his wife, Matt. xxvii. 19: "Have thou nothing to do with that just man;" in the Vulgate, "Nihil tibi et justo huic." What confirms this interpretation is, that whenever a thing is said not to concern a person, the preposition is used with the accusative. Thus, when Judas restores the price of his treason, saying that he had betrayed innocent blood, he is answered, τί πρὸς ἡμᾶς; σὺ ὄψει—"Quid *ad nos?* tu videris." (Ib. 4.) And when Peter eagerly inquires about John, our Saviour says to him, Τί πρός σε;—Quid *ad te?*"† "What is *it* to thee?" Precisely as in the classics; for instance, Martial,—

> "Sobrius siccus est Aper: quid *ad me?*"‡

These considerations are sufficient to prove that the accurate rendering of these words is the same as is given in Matt. xxvii. 19, "What have I to do with thee?" And we prefer this to the one given in the new version which heads our article: "What hast thou to do with me?" Because this seems to make the answer signify, "Why dost thou interfere with me?" a signification which the phrase does not generally bear; for it simply expresses the absence or denial of communication between the parties.

---

* Epigr. xxviii. In Podagr.

† John xx. 22.

‡ Lib. xii. epig. 30

The insertion, therefore, of the pronoun "it" destroys this sense completely, and determines the text in favor of a signification manifestly inaccurate.*

The philological discussion of this text ought naturally to end here. But an objection to the interpretation we have preferred will certainly start up in the mind of the pious reader. Is not the expression unaccountably harsh? Can we suppose our Blessed Saviour to have addressed his holy and dear mother in terms that disowned her, and denied all connection between them? Nay, we should feel but little satisfaction ourselves in this discussion, did we feel, at its close, that we had by it derogated aught from her honor, whom, from infancy, we have been taught especially to reverence; or that we had successfully striven to establish an interpretation which apparently favored the cavils of our religious adversaries. For we are aware how this translation has been considered by some as discountenancing our Catholic feelings towards God's mother by proving that her own Son treated her with little respect. Such, for instance, is the view presented by a certain Mr. Ford Vance, a chosen preacher against our doctrines, who having quoted the Protestant version, thus observes:—"The Roman Catholics say that this is a wrong translation of the passage. and that it should be rendered, 'Woman, what is that to you and to me?'" And in reply he appeals to Matt. viii. 29.* Our preceding remarks will be sufficient to show that we have no wish whatever to assert any such thing. But we deny all the consequences which he and others would draw from their version, and assert that the most timid Catholic need fear nothing in adopting it.

---

* However, Prof. Scholz, in his version of the Gospels (Francf. 1829), has retained this meaning. "Weib, was kümmert das mich und dich?" That of Augusti and De Wette (Heidelb. 1814) has: "Weib, was habe ich mit dir zu beschaffen?"

It is easy to prove that the expression in question might be, and often was, used in the most respectful and even affectionate manner; and as some of our examples, at least, have not been before quoted, we will enter more fully into the matter. We have a stronger motive for so doing, that even writers not engaged on controversy have expressed themselves differently from what we deem the truth. Thus Lambert Bos describes the phrase in general, as one "qua molestia et contemptus innuitur."†

---

* Sermons on the Invocation of Angels and Saints. Serm. ii. p. 40.

† Ellipses Græcæ, ed. Schäffer, 1808, p. 227.

In the New Testament it certainly is used respectfully by Pilate's wife, when she calls Jesus "that just man." Nor, we think, can it be doubted that the expostulation of the evil spirits, to which Mr. Vance refers, has the same character. For they give him his most glorious title, saying, "What have we to do with thee, Jesus, Son of God?" and then they make a supplicating request to be allowed to enter into the swine; which is granted them. In the Old Testament, the phrase is used in the same manner. For instance, there surely was neither "annoyance nor contempt" intended in those words whereby the widow obtained from the prophet the resurrection of her son:—"What have I to do with thee, thou man of God? Art thou come to call my sins to remembrance, and to slay my son?"* There is an expression similar in signification, which is manifestly used with similar feelings. We allude to Luke v. 8, where Peter, falling on his knees before Jesus, says to him, "*Depart from me*, for I am a sinful man, O Lord!" It is exceeding respect which, in these two cases, suggests expressions, at first sight indicative of a wish to have no communication with the person addressed.

Among profane writers the same use of the phrase may be easily proved. When the banished poet addresses his writings in these words,—

"Quid mihi vobiscum est, infelix cura, libelli,
Ingenio perii qui miser ipse meo?"†

---

* 1 Reg. xvii. 18.

† Trist. lib. ii. elig. i. 1

there is certainly expressed a feeling of affection and attachment to his unfortunate productions. The most respectful use of the expression is made in the East. In the account of a "good monitor," published by Rosegarten, we are told, how, upon a message being brought him that the caliph wished to see him, he replied, ما لي ولامير المؤمنين "What have I to do with the prince of the faithful?"* This was certainly not said with any intention of slighting that personage, whose call he obeyed; for his conduct is described with a desire to commend, and to propose it as an example.

But we will quote another instance which we flatter ourselves will leave no room to doubt that this expression could be used in the most affectionate manner. The emperor Marcus Aurelius closes one of his letters to his beloved preceptor, Fronto, in these words:—"Valebis mihi Fronto, ubi ubi es, mellitissime, meus amor, mea voluptas. *Quid mihi tecum est?* amo absentem."†

These examples are more than sufficient to prove that our Saviour could use the phrase as we have interpreted it, without incurring the imputation of undutifulness, which some writers, in their zeal against Catholics, seem almost eager to cast upon him. It may have been spoken in the most respectful and affectionate manner; and, as commentators have remarked, our Blessed Lady did not view it in the light of a refusal or a check; for after it, she felt sure that her prayer was granted, and gave directions for the working of the miracle.

---

* Chrestom. Arab. Lips. 1828, p. 36.

† M. C. Frontonis et M. Aurelii. Epist. Romæ, 1823, p. 105.

VIII.—The length to which we have been carried by several of our examples obliges us to suppress many others on which we would willingly have dilated. We must, however, for the present omit them, and will briefly advert to one only. This is Heb. xi. 1, where the Latin word, "substantia," is rendered "substance." "Faith is the *substance* of things to be hoped for." This rendering leads the reader to a wrong conclusion; as faith may be the indication, or demonstration, but certainly not the substance, of what we hope for. The Rheims translators say that the Latin word here bore the meaning of its corresponding Greek, ὑποστασις, "groundwork," or "foundation;" and though, with their usual caution, they retained the very word "substance," they added a marginal note to this effect: "By this word substance is meant, that faith is the ground of our hope." The note has disappeared, but the word which they knew to be unintelligible without it, has been retained. The Anglican version has the same word, but likewise adds an explanatory marginal note. A reference to the original Greek could alone guide the translator of the Vulgate; because the Latin word could never have been supposed to have this meaning, except as equivalent to that Greek term.

It may be necessary even sometimes to consult St. Jerome's commentary, to ascertain the exact sense in which he used words or phrases. For example:—"Butyrum et mel comedet, *ut* sciat reprobare malum et eligere bonum."* From his commentary on this passage, it is evident that he used the particle *ut* in the sense of *quamvis*, as Ovid does—

> "Ut desint vires, tamen est laudanda voluntas."†

The sense would be, that the Messiah should eat the common food of infants, although he, in truth, possessed discretion and knowledge.

These examples are, we trust, sufficient to elucidate our views regarding a complete and authorized revisal of our English Catholic version. Much we have to say respecting the prefaces and notes, the indices and titles, which should accompany any such authorized edition. On these matters it will be time enough to express our sentiments when we shall perceive that the hints here thrown out have been esteemed worthy of notice; and that attention is turned to the necessity or propriety of providing us with a standard edition, no longer subject to alteration from the caprice or ignorance of individuals. The new version which has led to the remarks we have made in this paper, cannot, as we have already observed, supersede the necessity of such a revision. With several of its verbal changes we are certainly pleased; but there are others of which we cannot bring ourselves to approve. The change of "Christ" into "Messiah," and "gospel" into "good tidings," seems unnecessary, and likely to startle ordinary readers. For the rejected words have long become part of the language.

---

* Isa. viii. 15.

† De Ponto, lib. iii. ep. iv. 19.

Throughout the notes and preface there is a drift which cannot be overlooked, and which has our cordial approbation; it is to place the gospels in their proper light, not as narratives intended to form a complete digest of our Saviour's life, but as "occasional pieces," so to speak, suggested by particular circumstances, and primarily directed to readers possessing different qualifications from ours, who could understand much that to us must be obscure. The impression on the reader's mind, after having perused this edition, must be, that Christianity never depended, for its code or evidences, upon the compilation of these documents, and that they never could have been intended for a rule of faith. Considering the work in this light, we have an additional pleasure in bearing witness to the learning, diligence, and acuteness of its author.

THE

PARABLES

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT,

AS ILLUSTRATING CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

[From the *Dublin Review* for September, 1849.]

The Four Gospels, translated from the Latin Vulgate, and diligently compared with the original Greek Text, being a revision of the Rhenish Translation, with Notes, Critical and Explanatory. By F. P. KENRICK, Bishop of Philadelphia. 8vo. New York, 1849.

ANY work from the pen of Bishop Kenrick must be received with interest and with respect by every Catholic who speaks the English language. His varied and extensive learning, his great researches, his distinguished abilities, and his sound orthodoxy, combined with his high position in the Church, must give weight to all that he publishes. The work before us is another proof of his lordship's zeal, and another monument of his learning; and as such we sincerely welcome it. The object of this new version, with its commentary, appears to be two-fold. First, it is intended to vindicate the Catholic Vulgate, and show its superiority to the Anglican version; secondly, it is directed, both by modifications of the ordinary Catholic translation, and by short notes, to remove difficulties, and facilitate the reading of the gospels. It is by no means a controversial work; the annotations do not undertake to meet those misrepresentations which result from erroneous doctrine; and on the whole, they will be probably much valued and read by Protestants, as well as Catholics.

The work acquires, in our minds, an additional importance from another consideration. It is the first attempt to bring before the notice of ordinary Catholic readers the critical study of the text. It is an undoubted fact, that all modern judicious critics will give great weight, and even preference, to the Vulgate, or Latin version, beyond the ordinary Greek text, where the two differ. The reason is simple. On these occasions, the oldest and best manuscripts, and the most ancient versions, almost invariably agree with the Vulgate; and their concurrent testimony establishes the fact, that the Vulgate represents manuscripts more accurate than have been used to form the received Greek text. When we consider the scorn cast by the reformers upon the Vulgate, and their recurrence, in consequence, to the Greek, as the only accurate standard, we cannot but rejoice at the silent triumph which truth has at length gained over clamorous error. For, in fact, the principal writers who have avenged the Vulgate, and obtained for it its critical pre-eminence, are Protestants. But though such a judgment has long been passed by the learned, the great bulk of readers, including men of education, no doubt fancy as yet that the Greek must always have the preference; and even Catholics may not be free from this opinion. Now Bishop Kenrick has taken the simplest mode of removing it. He shows, in few words, that where the Anglican version agrees with the Greek, but differs from the Latin, the best modern Protestant critics give the preference to the latter.

We have no doubt that this exposure will do much good. At the same time it suggests to us the fear, and shall we add, the shame, that we are not altogether prepared for these critical remarks. We do not believe that Catholics are worse off than their neighbors, who profess to draw all their faith from Scripture. But as it is not our place to think for these, we naturally confine our remarks to our own body; and we regret to say, that we have not an English Catholic elementary book of biblical introduction. Little or no study is made in our schools of the preliminary matter requisite for reading the Bible, although we are sure that the subject could be made as interesting as it is important. Upon this topic we would willingly dilate, did we not view it in connection with deeper considerations, and a wider range of defects than we can at present dwell on. But whoever has paid attention to biblical critical studies, and knows the niceties of the questions in which they get involved, and has tried to unravel the perplexities of *recensions* and their theories, and has experienced how difficult it is to fix the date of a manuscript or a version, or to weigh conflicting evidence about any text, will fear, we think, with us, that very few indeed of such readers as Dr. Kenrick will secure, will be able to appreciate the critical portion of his notes, or to understand their drift. Nor can we hope that the very brief "Explanations" at the beginning of the volume, containing necessarily so many hard names, and allusions to matters with which ordinary readers are not familiar, will very effectually assist them. If Dr. Kenrick, or any other sound theological scholar who could sift the chaff from the wheat in modern scriptural writers, would supply the want to which we have alluded, he would confer a lasting advantage on our body.

The second object proposed in the learned bishop's notes is, we think, of greater practical utility: and we do not hesitate to say that many readers will derive great benefit from their perusal. They will find many terms and phrases explained, which they have possibly often read without attaching any very definite idea to them; they will see apparent discrepancies very simply reconciled, and obscure passages briefly, but ably, illustrated. This book will, in many cases, dispense with the necessity of consulting larger commentaries.

And again, on this subject, we will express a hope, that this work will lead to others in scriptural learning, and those not merely introductory, but deep, earnest, and solid. For we are fully convinced that the field belongs exclusively to Catholics, and that they alone can properly occupy it. After all the boasted researches of the moderns, what has been done? What are the commentaries of Kuinoël, Rosenmüller, Campbell, or Bloomfield? Sapless, heartless, devotionless, merely critical and philological notes, which help one not a step to taste and relish the sweetness of the divine narrative, or to learn its true lessons. There is in them neither breadth of view nor depth of penetration; they walk you over the surface, and, if anything, deaden the perception of those inner and hidden treasures, those rich mines, which lie beneath the latter. And this must be the case with all Protestant Scripture learning. The tender mysteries of our Saviour's nativity and holy childhood, associated at every moment with His Blessed Mother; His kindness towards sinners, and his familiarity with the poor; the sorrowful scenes of His passion, in their details, as meditated upon by Catholic Saints;* all these it is impossible for a Protestant mind to view or dwell on, with the intensity and affectionateness that a Catholic heart requires. Then what can a Protestant do with the evangelical counsels, poverty and chastity, and renouncing of all possessions; with the apostles, sent without scrip or staff to preach to heathens; with celibacy and virginity; with fasting and watching; with the forgiveness of sins, and the eating of Christ's body; with miracles and wonders to be wrought in the Church? He must try to show that some of these things are figurative, and that others only applied to the apostolic times; and that, in fact, they are nothing to us. Only the Catholic can fully and lovingly enter into the heart of God's word, and feel its whole truth and perfect reality. The others must be ever reasoning, while we are content to receive impressions.

---

* A curious inquiry to pursue, but not here, would be the following!—How far has the rejection and condemnation, by Protestantism; of pictures and sculptures, conduced to the suppression of meditation, which is a mental repre-

We feel, therefore, deeply convinced, that if we would only take full possession of Scripture, and place it before those who love, or affect to love, it, in its true and Catholic light, and draw from it its practical, yet most moving lessons, in the Catholic spirit, we should easily convince our adversaries that ours is the only religion of Scripture, and our inheritance its interpretation. But perhaps we shall best explain our meaning by endeavoring to exemplify what we have said.

---

sentation? We believe much. To take one instance—could a person who has never seen a crucifix possibly realize to his mind the crucifixion?

Let us take, for instance, one characteristic point of our Saviour's teaching, and endeavor to develop in it, and through it, the principle which we have laid down;—that it requires a Catholic view of it to do it full justice, while yet this does not exclude those modes of illustration which may be deemed the common property of every scholar, though they require the chastening hand of orthodox religion safely to apply them.

Were any one asked, what is the peculiar feature of Our Saviour's teaching, as preserved for us in the Gospels, he would naturally answer, that it consists in His constant use of parables and similitudes. The answer would no doubt be correct, so far as comparison with other known methods of instruction can lead us. Not only the Fathers and later teachers in the Church pursue a system that may seem the very opposite, but even the Apostles, who naturally imbibed the Spirit of their holy Master, and sought to be like him, disclose no traces of this mode of delivering doctrine. Nor can this be the result of want of genius, or of imagination, or of any other faculty. For they wrote under the influence of Divine inspiration, and the Holy Spirit who breathed in, and through, them, and who guided their pens, could have suggested to them parables and illustrations, as easily as simple dogmatic instruction. If He did not so, if in this respect they were guided to depart from the model of their Lord and Teacher, there must have been reasons why that mode should remain sacredly His, and not be considered suitable to them. Again, this could not be because the apostles had to address, in their writings, a different class of disciples. Several of their epistles are directed to the same Jewish people, whether still living in their own country, or dispersed in distant lands. In every respect these compositions bear the Jewish stamp, in style, in reasoning, in quotations, in allusions, in illustration, in figures of speech, in cast of thought. The strongest internal evidence of their genuineness results from this decisive mark of origin combined with the novelty of their doctrine, and their connection with the gospel system. If, therefore, our Saviour chose the mode of instruction by parables to gratify a Jewish taste, or to gain the Jewish mind, we might naturally expect that, after His justification of such a course, it would have been pursued by His first followers. And if we say, on the other hand, that the apostles wrote rather for the Church in aftertimes, we shall surely belie our best thoughts and feelings, if we do not consider that every word which our blessed Lord spoke was as completely addressed to His spouse as to any unbelieving Jew.

We cannot be surprised that this peculiar choice, by our Redeemer, of His method of instruction, should have engaged the attention of religious minds, and of ecclesiastical writers. Good and solid reasons have been given for His preference; the beauties of His different parables have been unfolded by many an eloquent pen; and the lessons which each contains have been expounded, illustrated, and inculcated, with an almost endless variety of explanation. Each may be likened to a simple theme in music, upon which many composers will elaborate many variations; through all which the original strain will be heard, though one may seem to droop in mournful key and languid measure, and another to sparkle in all the brilliancy of the wildest caprice. Every parable has been preached upon, commented upon, meditated upon, written on; chapters, essays, volumes almost, have been devoted to several of them; their literal, their allegorical, their spiritual, their doctrinal, their ascetic sense has been fully drawn out, sometimes into a very wire of attenuated detail, sometimes into beautiful "chains of gold inlaid with silver,"* the chaste delicacy of the commentary enhancing the rich brilliancy of the text. In so well-reaped a field, what can *we* hope to glean? Can we, for a moment, flatter ourselves, that we can add another thought, or even another fancy, to the luxuriance of past illustrators; or that we can throw any additional light upon the method itself of parabolic teaching, after all that has been written concerning it?

We would not put such questions into our reader's thoughts, did we feel ourselves compelled to answer them directly; were it necessary either to give a presumptuous affirmative reply, and so forfeit his confidence; or, at once, by a self-condemning negative, cut off our right to pen another line on the subject. We will do neither; but will rather trust ourselves to his indulgence and generosity, to take it for granted that we would not willingly waste the pages of our Review, nor trifle with his patience; and that, therefore, if, merely taking our suggestion from the volume before us, we venture to lead him on so beaten a road, it is not without the hope that we may draw his attention to something which he may have passed by before. There is no great merit in this. It may be that we have travelled it over more frequently than he, because our business and duty led us regularly that way; it may be that we have had more leisure than he in going along it, and so have sauntered, and loitered, and looked about us more; it may be that we have walked on it in the company of those wiser than ourselves, who, in oriental phrase, may have dropped the pearls of their sage words upon it, and we may remember where, and pick them up as we go on; or it may be that we have held in our hands, as we journeyed, some quaint old volumes, that collected its histories, its traditions, its associations, and hidden sources of interest. If so, there can be but small pretension in embodying the results of such slender and such pleasant industry, and offering them to others. And having got thus far, let us conclude these introductory remarks by boldly stating that we think there are some views of this method of teaching which have not received their full elucidation, and which yet present a strong attraction; that the system, both in its principles and in its details, bears powerfully upon the evidences both of Christianity in general, and of Catholicity more particularly; and that, moreover, many of the aids to appreciating the full beauty of our Lord's method of instruction, are locked up in works too much out of ordinary readers' way to be familiar to them, or are derived from sources not likely to reach them; which yet are not sufficiently brought forward, as they might be, to enhance the interest, or deepen the impressions, of these sacred lessons.

---

* Cant. i. 10.

If we take any portion of our Saviour's discourses in the three first Gospels, we are struck at once with the richness of its texture. It is like a beautiful piece of tessellated work, composed of rich designs of imagery, each of which is beautiful in itself, but runs into the next, while perhaps, in the midst, to continue our image, comes a fuller and more finished picture, set as in a rich border. There is hardly a sentence that descends to what we should call prose; every thought is conveyed in a sententious, proverbial, and easily-remembered form; or it is a beautiful and perfect simile, or comparison with natural objects, or ordinary usages, such as conveys the lesson familiarly, and gives it a hold on the mind and memory; or it is a more formal and complete allegory, corresponding point by point with a more solemn lesson. Now, to every one of these forms of speech the term PARABLE is applied. For we may observe that the terms *proverb* and *parable* are almost convertible in Scripture language. In the three first Gospels, the figurative instructions of our Lord are called Παραβολη; in St. John this word does not occur once; but the word Παροιμια is always used instead.[*] It is true, the latter means a similitude as well as the former; but it is the title given by the Septuagint, to what we call the *Proverbs* of Solomon; and these again are called in the text Παραβολαι,[†] though they exactly correspond to what we should call proverbs. Besides the philological reasons for this commutation of terms,[‡] we may assign a very natural one. It is that what we call a *proverb*, a similitude, and a parable, are only more or less condensed forms of the same species of speech. A proverb or sententious saying, containing in it deep meaning and practical truth, may be easily considered as the moral of a fable or parable, and its frequently figurative form would very often give, at once, the clue to such an illustration. This building of stories upon proverbs has been so often done, that it would be almost childish to dwell upon it. Franklin's story of "paying dear for one's whistle," will suffice as an instance. Again, to return to our subject, when our Lord thus addresses his fellow-townsmen:—"Doubtless you will say to me this similitude (παραβολὴν): Physician, heal thyself."[*] It is plain that this expression corresponds exactly to what we should call a proverb, yet who does not see in it, at once, a full parable, which scarcely requires development? A physician loudly proclaims his skill in curing every, or some particular, complaint: a patient sends for him, and sees at once that he is as sick as himself, and that his boasted method of cure has not answered in his own case. He very naturally rejects him as an empiric, and bids him first cure

---

[*] We may likewise here remark, that *only* in St. Luke is the word παραβολη rendered by *similitudo* in the Vulgate, seven or eight times. In St. Matthew and St. Mark this is never found.

[†] Prov. i. 1; xxv. 1.

[‡] The Hebrew word whereby the Proverbs of Solomon are called משל *mashal*, corresponds to the Arabic مثل *methel*, *like*. It is curious to observe what an influence on all modern European languages the corresponding word in Latin has exercised. From *fabula, a fable*, comes *fabulari*, to converse; hence the old Spanish *fablar* (now, by an ordinary conversion, *hablar*), Portuguese *fallar*, Italian *parlare*. French *parler*, and hence our *parlor* and our *parliament!* This proves that wherever the Latin language was vernacular, the ordin-

---

ary word in conversation for *to speak* was this. And hence we may trace back to the oldest period of the language, the familiar use of apologues and fictitious narratives. In fact, Livy calls Memmius's apologue on the Mons Sacer, the *priscum et horridum dicendi genus.*

[*] Luke iv. 23.

himself with his nostrums, before he tries them on others. "Physician," he exclaims, "heal thyself." It matters not whether the phrase arose out of an apologue, or leads to it; whether it be the fruit or the seed, is all one.

If, therefore, among the Jews, a proverb, a similitude, and a parable, were considered as but different degrees of the same form of expression, and if our Lord's discourses were almost entirely made up of the three, we can easily see how literally those words of the sacred text meant to apply,—"all these things Jesus spoke in parables to the multitude, and without parables he did not speak to them."*

It is manifest that a marked difference may be expected, as to novelty, between those shorter proverbial phrases, and those poetical comparisons by which our Saviour conveys simpler moral and dogmatic truths, and those longer parables which contain in them a complete system of doctrines. No one, however wise, when conversing with ordinary men, will always employ original phrases, nor even deliver original ideas. He must be understood, and, to keep up the interest of an audience, say many things which have been said before. Proverbs, which carry in them the thoughts and experience of the good and the wise, have become a public property; they will be used by the very best and wisest; but they will be used aptly, happily, more strikingly than by others; and what is still more important, they will receive fresh strength and higher meaning, and be made to contain some new and great truth. In examining the shorter parables of our blessed Lord, there is danger of two extremes: of considering everything as new, and so rejecting all illustration from other sources, on the one hand, and of trusting too much to the light which these may throw upon them, on the other. The latter was the crime of that wretched school of bibilical literature which rose in Germany in the course of the last century; was matured to avowed rationalism in this; not so much poisoned, as withered up, the last fibres of faith which Protestantism yet held by; tainted this country with a venom which has not yet fully developed; and then seems to have gone out, like a noxious vapor, kindled for a time by an infernal flame. In its insidious beginnings, this was one of its worst deceits: that overlooking or rejecting ecclesiastical teaching and tradition, it sought, with perverted erudition, for all its illustrations of God's word out of it, and of the natural channel of interpretation. But, on the other hand, to reject totally the aid of such secondary sources of illustration, is, in truth, not merely to reject such light as they can cast on the sacred text, but to exclude what helps much to raise the character of our Lord Himself to its true dignity. Let us examine a few instances.

---

* Matt. xiii. 34.

Our Saviour makes use of a most appropiate illustration in the following passage:—"How sayest thou to thy brother: let me cast the mote out of thine eye, and behold a beam in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then thou shalt see to cast the mote out of thy brother's eye?"* Now we can hardly doubt that this was a proverbial expression among the Jews, for we find it quoted as such in the Rabbins, but with a very different effect. "It is written that in the time of the judges, that if any one said, 'Cast out the mote (stalk) from thy eye;' the other would answer, 'Cast out the beam from thine.'"† "Rabbi Tarphon said: 'I wonder if in this age there be any one who will receive correction; for if any one says to another, Cast out the mote from thine eye, he would answer him, Cast the beam out of thine.'"‡ Similar passages occur elsewhere. As here used, the expression was clearly one of retort, and he who used it is evidently blamed. The haughty Pharisee, the unbelieving Sadducee, the scandalous priest, was no doubt generally the reprover of others' failings (for *they* were not "as the rest of men"), and to them was the retort frequently and justly addressed. Now our Lord exactly takes part with those who make it, but He goes further still, and takes it in God's name, and brands with the terrible name of "hypocrite," him who dares to incur the injustice of correcting others, while he is guilty of even greater sins. His treatment of the accusers of the woman taken in adultery,* is the best illustration of this meaning. But Christ's application of the familiar proverb rises higher; it goes to teach, what Jewish doctor never thought of, mutal forbearance, gentleness in dealing with others' defects, strict scrutiny into our own failings rather than into theirs, and self-correction before we undertake the delicate office of directing others. And thus, as in that same sermon on the mount, He took the texts of the old law, and amended them for the new, in all that regarded charity, so did He no less those familiar and additional phrases, current among the teachers of the people.

---

* Matt. vii. 4, 5.

† Bava Bathra, f. x. 2.

‡ Erachin, f. xvi. 2.

Let us take another example, which has given rise to much strange discussion :—"It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven."† Even in ancient times, as appears from marginal notes on manuscripts, there was a disposition to modify the apparent harshness of this text. A camel passing through the eye of a needle seemed almost incongruous; and hence by changing *κάμηλος* into *κάμιλος*, a "camel" into a "cable," a more natural connection was sought to be given between the two terms employed: "a cable passing through the eye of a needle." Drusius warmly espoused this reading;‡ and others followed him. But no sensible commentator would now adopt so useless an attempt at emendation. There can be little doubt that the expression was a proverbial one, to imply an impossibility. For with the exception of the animal mentioned we find the same proverb in use in central and eastern Asia. In those countries the largest beast of burthen was the elephant, and the image in the comparison was naturally drawn from it. In the *Bava Metsia*, one of the Talmudic treatises, a person thus addresses another who dealt in wonders: "Perhaps you are from the city of Pumbeditha, where they make an elephant pass through the eye of a needle."* And in another work it is written: "They do not show a golden palm, nor an elephant going through the eye of a needle."† Dr. Frank has given a similar proverb as Indian: "As if an elephant were to try to pass through a small opening."‡ What the elephant was to the oriental Asiatic, the camel was to the western: the proverb would naturally present this substitution of animals, yet be substantially the same. Hence, the Arabs have the proverb, with the camel, as in the gospel.§ But what an awful severity, what a definitely acute edge, does not this vague and general expression, more of incredulity than of impossibility, receive, when applied, as by our Lord, to the difficulty, for the rich, of entering His kingdom. And how increased is the strength of the figure, by the appeal, which follows it, to God's omnipotence, as the sole power that can reverse or modify the sentence. "With men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible,"* and therefore this. So firmly welded and riveted have the two parts of the sentence become, in our Saviour's mouth, that no power will ever again separate them; it would be profane to reduce again to a general expression of difficulty, or human impossibility, that which has been definitely appropriated by Him, to declare the most terrible moral truth of His divine religion.

---

* **John viii.**

† **Matt. xix. 24.**

‡ *In loc.* and in his treatise on Heb. Proverbs, in Crit. Sac. tom. v.

---

* Fol. xxxviii. 2.

† Beracoth, fol. lv. 2.

‡ 50th,—Continuation of the Accounts of the E. I. Missionaries. *Halle*, 1742.

§ It occurs in the Koran, Sur. vii. 38:—"They who charge our signs with falsehood, and reject them, the gates of heaven shall be closed against them, and they shall not enter Paradise till a camel pass the eye of a needle."

We can easily conceive how this familiarity with the proverbial forms of speech in use among the Rabbins and learned men of His nation, this apt and elegant use of their favorite expressions, and this power of giving them new and peculiar beauties, gained Him at once the respect and confidence of the people; associated Him, of right, with their admitted teachers; shut the jealous mouths of these men; and delighted and charmed all; till they would remain whole days, regardless of food, in His society. Hence, even in that very place where He was no prophet, the people "all gave testimony to Him: and they wondered at the words of grace that proceeded from His mouth, and they said, Is not this the son of Joseph?"* But what doubtless added still further to enhance the beauty and gracefulness of His discourse was the readiness with which His illustrations and comparisons seemed to spring from the objects around, or from the most homely subjects. How important this consideration is, when we study our Saviour's more formal parables, we shall see later: but in the shorter images,--the *fabellæ breviores*, as Quintilian calls them, this obvious facility of taking them up must have rendered them much more striking and interesting. The whitening corn-fields suggests the thought of the spiritual harvest ripe for the sickle;† the fig-tree, putting forth its fruit furnishes a lesson on the coming of God's kingdom. "*See* the fig-tree, and all the trees, when they *now* shoot forth their fruit."‡ When discoursing on the mount, how happily the birds flitting about furnish a beautiful image: "*Behold* the birds of the air:" and the lilies which spring up, as travellers inform us, on that very ground, give rise to that still more graceful similitude, "*Consider* the lilies of the field how they grow: they labor not, neither do they spin. But I say to you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed as one of these."§ Then every action and operation of the household, and of ordinary life —the grinding at the mill;[*] the leavening of the dough;[†] the good housewife's hoard;[‡] the governing of the house;[§] the cultivation of the vineyard, from its planting[¶] to its yielding fruit;[‖] the tillage of the field[1] and of the garden;[2] the pastoral life in its smallest details,[3]—each furnishes him with most appropriate imagery, and most pertinent illustration. At the same time even the more refined and luxurious life of the higher classes is no less fertile in His hand; the management of the estate;[4] the distribution of confidential duties to servants;[5] the sumptuous

---

* Matt. xix. 26.

---

* Luke iv. 22. † John iv. 35. ‡ Luke xxi. 29.

§ Matt. vi. 26, 28. Solomon is the Crœsus of oriental poetry. The prince of Persian poets, Hafez, has a similar figure:—

جو گل سوار شود بر هوا سليمان وار

"When the rose rides on the air like Solomon."

(Rosseau's Flowers of Pers. Liter. p. 165.) The rose is in Persian, what the lily is in Hebrew, poetry.

[*] Matt. xxiv. 41.

[†] Luke xiii. 21.

[‡] Luke xv. 8.

[§] Luke xii. 35.

[¶] Mat. xx. 1; xxi. 33; Mark xii. 1; Luke xx. 9.

[‖] John xv. 1—6. "Every branch that beareth fruit, he (the husbandman) will purge it, that it may bring forth more fruit" (v. 2). This same figure is beautifully applied almost in the same words, by the Persian poet Saadi:—

زکوة مال بدر کن که فضله رزرا
چو باغبان ببرد بیشتر دهد اعگور

"Distribute in alms the tithe of thy wealth; for the more the gardener cuts away the redundancy of the vine, the more fruit it gives."—Gulistan, chap. ii. tale. xlix.

[1] Matt. xiii. 3, 24; Mark iv. 3, 26; Luke viii. 4.

[2] Luke xiii. 6.

[3] Matt. xviii. 12; Luke xv. 4; John x. 1.

[4] Luke xvi. 1.

[5] Matt. xxv. 1; Luke xix. 12.

feast;[*] the bridal procession;[†] the processes of law;[‡] even political events of recent occurrence,[§] serve for Him as groundwork of most expressive and beautiful lessons. And there is every reason to suppose, that even such detailed and pointed parables as that of the rich man and Lazarus had a basis of fact, and alluded to characters and incidents well known.

---

[*] Matt. xxii. 12; Luke xiv. 16. We are tempted to introduce another oriental illustration of an important feature of this parable. (v. 11.) The guests called in on a sudden are all found clothed in a wedding, or feasting, garment (for γάμος expresses the feast), corresponding to the Roman *cœnatorium*. There is only one exception. As he is severely reprimanded and punished for not having one, and yet he and all his fellow-guests were poor, we must suppose that rich garments were given to them, and that gross neglect, or some worse fault, was imputable to the unrobed guest. Now Fakr-Eddin Razi informs us how Jaffar, the son of Yaya, in the days of the great Egyptian khalif Haroun Al Rashid, used to have in his palace secret banquets, and that the guests all put on garments of various colors, red, yellow, or green, and the forbidden cup circulated freely among them. One day he had assembled in his apartments all his boon-companions except one, whose name was Abd el-melik, and he left orders with his porter to admit none but him. It happened, however, that there was at court another of that name, a man of austere morals, whom Jaffar had in vain endeavored to draw to his jovial parties. He happened to come to speak on business, gave his name, and was admitted by the unsuspecting porter. The guests were surprised and confounded at his appearance: but he, without embarrassment, joined the party, and said, "Bring me also one of those rich garments;" and only after he had been thus clothed, asked for a cup of wine.—Sacy's Chrestom. Arabe, pp. 35, 36 of text.

[†] Matt. xxv. 1. [‡] Ib. v. 25. [§] Luke xix. 14.

When we consider, in addition, that in almost every case these parables could not have been prepared, but were introduced in discourses arising from casual events, or were spoken in answer to sudden questions, we shall not be surprised at the delight which they gave his audience, and how they found his words truly full of elegance and grace. What we have said will enable us to explain the beautiful description which our Lord himself gives us of His own mode of teaching. After the remarkable series of parables in the thirteenth chapter of St. Matthew, in which the Church is symbolized as a field, a treasure, a pearl, and a net, our Saviour, having explained them to His disciples, thus addresses them:—"Have you understood all these things? They say to Him, Yes. He said unto them, Therefore is every scribe [or Doctor] instructed in the kingdom of heaven, like unto a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure [that is, his store] new things and old." (vv. 51, 52.) Our Lord, having made use of different parables, some from common life, as the sowing of a field, or a draught of fishes, others from more extraordinary occurrences, such as the finding of a treasure, or of an invaluable pearl, asks His apostles if they understood all these illustrations. They answer Him affirmatively. *Therefore*, He replies, that is because you find these different images so clear, you see herein the skill of the experienced religious teacher. He is like an economical householder, who has carefully stored up objects of every kind, some old, some new, and knows where always to find just the thing that he requires. So the good teacher, who has treasured up in his mind a rich collection of varied learning, will be ready always to cull out just what is wanted, old things or new: the old, by adapting to his doctrine ancient maxims, proverbs, and wise sayings, as well as historical events; and the new, by seizing the occurrences of the moment, or objects that are present, and turning them to the profit of his scholars.

We have seen how admirably and how perfectly Christ did this. But His hearers not only found His words full of grace, but they marked a difference between His teaching and that of their usual instructors, which they described in this phrase: that "He was teaching them as one having power, and not as the Scribes and Pharisees."* Besides the remarkable and most important meaning which we hope later to draw from these words, we may easily explain what the Jews meant by reference to the corresponding teaching of the Pharisees and Scribes. For we may here assume that their teaching is fairly represented to us by the lessons recorded in the Jewish writings, of the parables and sayings of the older Rabbins. We have not leisure or space to prove this; but it would not be difficult. We could show that St. Jerome refers to, and even, in his version, follows traditional Jewish interpretations to be found in Talmudic writings; and if any one desires to test this assertion within a very limited compass, we would refer him to his commentary on Osee. In like manner St. Ephrem has some peculiar comments which are manifestly traditional, agreeing most curiously with the Koran,* which certainly drew its accounts from the Jews. And St. James of Edessa, quoting one of these histories, about Melchisedec, informs us that it came from Jewish traditions.† St. James of Sarug does the same.‡ If therefore we are justified in considering the Jewish histories recorded in later writers, as traditions of far earlier periods, we shall be warranted in comparing the teaching of our Saviour with that there recorded: and the result will be what the people describe, in the text just cited. The teaching of the Jewish doctors and expounders of the law was frivolous, trivial, and childish, and related to every manner of petty distinction and dispute, respecting the law, ceremonial and moral. We do not recollect a single instance in which a masterly grasp of great principles is exhibited, in which anything like a broad, generous exalted view is taken of the whole law, or of a single precept. The character of this teaching could not possibly have been given in stronger and juster terms than it is by our Lord, when he reproaches them with measuring out their tithe of mint and cummin, and letting alone the weightier things of the law, judgment, and mercy, and faith, straining out a gnat, and swallowing a camel.* Compared with this, how healthy, vigorous, noble, and enlarged must the teaching of our Lord have justly appeared. There the spirit of the law had been clearly caught and defined, and the new and higher law that was engrafted on it, in the Sermon on the Mount, to which the Jews referred, was manifestly its rightful sequence and natural maturing to perfection. And every illustration introduced, instead of serving to perplex, and bind still further, as in the rabbinical teaching, simplified 'and explained His meaning most happily, and supported generous and exalted views of duty.

---

* Matt. vii. 29.

---

* As that Jacob knew the story brought him by his sons, of Joseph's death, to be untrue (*in loc.*): which is asserted in the Koran. (Sur. *Jusuphu.*) Again, that the rocks struck by Moses produced twelve fountains (Op. tom. i. p. 263), which again is found in the Koran. (Sur. ii.)

† Op. S. Ephrem. tom. i. p. 275.

‡ Ib. p. 274.

What we have written will guide us at least one step towards answering the question with which we started:—Why did our Lord choose to teach in parables, and why did not the apostles? Because it was necessary for him to claim and secure the title of a Master in Israel, a public teacher; and so to drive from the field the false teachers who held it, and who had so thoroughly perverted the old law that it was necessary to sweep away from it their corruptions, before the new could be fastened on it. This, which may be called the aggressive part of our Saviour's ministry, was not to be accomplished without great command, great vigor, and almost violence. And to it belong those strong and magnificent declamations, in which He thoroughly unmasks their hypocrisy, uncharitableness, and hidden vice. How was this work of power to succeed, save by Christ's showing himself fully equal to those rivals in all which their dupes, and the whole people, considered wisdom, and even assert successfully superiority over them in their own modes of teaching? And effectually we see, that though not brought up in their schools, nor associated with any of their sects, nor holding familiarity with any of them, and consequently having a coalition of Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, priests, and doctors, arrayed against Him, though cordially hating each other, He obtained the title which they most coveted,[*] that of Master,[*] Teacher,[‡] and Rabbi.[§] But though this was necessary for Him, it was not so for His followers. On the contrary, as they were to have "only one Master, Christ," they were forbidden to assume or to aspire to this title.*

---

* Matt. xiii. 23, *seq.*

---

[*] Matt. xxiii. 7.

[†] Matt. viii. 19; xii. 38; Luke ix. 38; xx. 21, 28, 39; John viii. 4, *et al. pass.*

[‡] Luke v. 5; viii. 24, 45, *et al. pass.* This word ἐπιστάτης is peculiar to St. Luke in the New Testament.

[§] Matt. xxvi. 25, 49; Mark ix 4; John i. 38; iii. 2, 26, *et al.*

But in addition to the position thus required by our Lord, for founding the Christian religion on the groundwork of the former revelation, there is another reason why he must be considered almost compelled to adopt the system of teaching by parables. This is, that it was associated throughout the East with the idea of wisdom. Solomon, the very type of wisdom, was the great parable, or proverb writer of the Jews.† When the Queen of Saba came to him, it was expressly to try his wisdom by enigmas or riddles,‡ which in those times were like parables.§ And the following is the description of a wise man:—"The wise man will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients.... he will keep the sayings of renowned men, and will enter withal into the subtleties of parables. He will search out the hidden meanings of proverbs, and will be conversant in the secrets of parables."‖ Jeremias celebrates the wisdom of the inhabitants of Theman, the capital of the Idumeans.¶ And Baruch tells us in what that wisdom consisted, when he speaks of "the children of Ager also, that search after the wisdom that is of the earth, the merchants of Merrha and Theman, and

---

* **Matt. xxiii. 8, 10.**

† **3 Reg. iv. 32.**

‡ 3 Reg. x. 1. Menander and Dius, the historians of Tyre, whose fragments are preserved by Eusebius, inform us that the friendship of Solomon and Hiram was kept up by their sending one another enigmas to solve.

§ As Jud. xiv. 14.

‖ Ecclus. xxxix. 1, 3.

¶ Jer. xlix. 7.

the tellers of fables, and *searchers of prudence and understanding.*"* We might add many examples more. But it was so throughout the East. The story of Œdipus proves it for Egypt. Æsop is the impersonation of that oriental wisdom, as it appeared in early Greece; and his fables may be traced through the Arabic of Lokman (surnamed as their writer, "the wise") and the Persian of Bidpai (known more popularly as Pilpay), to the Hipotadesa of India; a genealogy as clear as that of our numerals through Araby to India. The Armenians fall into the chain, through the fables of Vartbran. The Gulistan, or Rose-garden of Saadi, one of the most beautiful oriental poems, to which we have referred in a former note, consists entirely of a classified series of short parables, or tales, sometimes containing only the saying of some sage; each followed by an often exquisite strophe, containing the moral, or application. And not to multiply instances, suffice it to say, that so much authority is granted to this form of teaching among Mussulmans, that the prohibition to drink wine, now so important a feature in their religious code, rests entirely, not on the Koran, but on the teaching of a parable in the Taalim, their second religious book. So long, then, as, in the country and age in which our Saviour lived, the idea of wisdom was so completely involved in that of teaching by similitudes and parables, and this not rashly, but in accordance with the definitions of the sacred writings, and the character of acknowledged sages, it became Him, so far to adapt himself to these habitual and deeply-rooted views, as to insure the deepest and most reverential attention, as a sage. Nay, it was absolutely necessary that He should cope with Solomon himself in his own peculiar form of wisdom, that so He might confidently and boldly tell the Jews, "Behold more than Solomon is here!"* The meaning of these words is indeed very deep and solemn. For as the gift of wisdom to that king was given in terms that excluded rivalry from man,† to assert, so decidedly and so boldly, superiority to him, and that in One in whom humility was first shown to be a main part of wisdom, was equal to a declaration of His superior, and Divine, nature. For no one but the Giver of wisdom to Solomon could possess more wisdom than he.

---

* Bar. iii. 23.

These motives for teaching in the manner which alone would commend itself to the Jews, and secure their esteem, will in part explain those awful passages, in which our Lord seems to intimate that He taught them in parables, on purpose that they might not understand.‡ For we see that this necessity was one of their own making: and that the deafness and the blindness which followed from it, were the fruit of their obstin ate adherence to so imperfect a method of teaching.

---

* Luke xi. 31.

† I "have given thee a wise and understanding heart, in so much that there hath been no one like thee, before thee, *nor shall arise after thee.*"—3 Reg. iii. 12.

‡ Matt. xiii. 13, *seq.*

But the meaning of such passages will become perhaps more intelligible from our next consideration, which leads us into the main scope of our dissertation. If we accurately examine the whole system of teaching by parables adopted by our Lord we shall see that it corresponds to prophecy in the Old Law; that, in fact, in them is to be found the germ of the whole Christian system, as the history of Israel and Juda, and of Christ and His reign, is to be found in the prophets. As in the latter we have seldom anywhere one continued context on these subjects, but have to construct the web out of fragments and separate pieces, not without study and research; so likewise in the parables we have a variety of apparently detached lessons, which considered individually give but partial results, but which compared and joined together, throw marvellous light upon the whole theory of religion and the Church. In like manner, therefore, as the prophecies read or heard, when first uttered were generally most obscure, often unintelligible, and served even to irritate those who heard them,* and even made them harder than they were before; so were the parables, which alluded to a system not yet fully established, necessarily unintelligible, except in so far as, like prophecies of imminent fulfilment, they alluded to the commencement of the system. And as that beginning involved the destruction of the existing state and its upholders, it naturally irritated, provoked, and through their obstinate perversity even hardened, those unhappy men. At the same time it might happen, and it did happen, that a parable spoken in answer to a question, while beautifully pertinent, and sufficient for its present purpose, contained in it treasures of wisdom for the future Church, which could not possibly catch the eye of the first superficial observer. Let us illustrate our meaning by an example:—

---

* Jer. xxxvii. xxxviii.

In the thirteenth chapter of St. Matthew there is a series of parables relating to the "kingdom of heaven," that is the Church. These need not necessarily have been spoken all at the same time. The first of them, the parable of the sower, occurs in the three first Gospels, and all the Evangelists remark, that it was addressed to a vast multitude.* And in truth it may be well considered as the preliminary, or introductory parable to the whole series of the parables. For it lays down the necessary dispositions for receiving, with profit, the words of Christ, and particularly describes His ministry. But the other parables may be taken in the following order: 1. The seed then sown by Christ in this field of the world, that portion of it even which fell upon well-prepared ground, was soon to be disturbed by the enemy. A spurious seed would soon be scattered among it, and it would spring up side by side with the blade of genuine grain; that is, even in the Church itself, and among the faithful, there would arise corruptions, vices, and scandals; the parable of the cockle.* 2. The sowing of this seed has evidently two distinct operations, one on the individual, the other on the Church or world in general. The heart, the dispositions, of those to whom doctrine is addressed, are essential for the cultivation in its first instance: when many have received it within, these uniting would form the Church. To each one, then, this seed of true doctrine is of immense importance and value; it is the treasure, the pearl of immense price which must be purchased by sacrifice of all else.† When once hidden in the heart, it is as a leaven which will communicate its qualities on every side, and make the whole of society ferment with its spirit.‡ 3. That seed which will at first be so small, hidden, and confined, will now spring up about the earth; the grain long buried will become a great and glorious tree.§ A portion only of all this belonged to the Jews; the duty of receiving Christ's doctrine,laying it to heart, and being ready to surrender all to possess it. The rest is prophetic, belongs to the future, and neither friend nor foe could understand it then. It required fulfilment, and as no one but our Lord himself knew what His kingdom, or Church, was to be, so no one, till the time came, could fully see the beauty of the applications. The time did come at length; and we shall see how admirable is the wisdom which this teaching laid up in store for us.

---

* Matt. xiii. 3; Mark iii. 3; Luke viii. 4.

---

* Matt. xiii. 24

† Ib. 44, 45.

‡ Ib. 33.

§ Ib. 31.

There has never been any founder of a false sect, whether deceived himself by fanaticism, or deceiving others in malice, who has not promised and pretended to make a perfect system. The world, if it receive their doctrine, is to be regenerated, the elect alone have to reign, or even to exist: vice and evil are to disappear before their doctrines and rule. Mohammed taught this, and used the sword of extermination to realize it. It formed the groundwork of the so-called reformation, beginning with the mischievous tenets of Wycliffe and Huss, that sin put an end to all rights, down to the murderous ravings of the German Anabaptists, the fanatical brutishness of the Cromwellian Puritans, and the wild dreams of Mormonites or Agapemonites. Certainly the beginning of the Church might easily have seduced men into the same dream; and the sight of the one-hearted church of Jerusalem, or of the love-bound community of Alexandria, might have made sanguine believers hope that a state of unmixed virtue was beginning to prevail on earth. But jealousy and contest soon came in to dispel the vision. It was not, however, till many years after that this false principle assumed the form of a specific heresy. It is essentially in every heresy; it lurked in the early sects; it appeared palpably in Novatianism and Montanism; but it incarnated itself in Donatism. The basis of that heresy and schism was, that the Church could only consist of incorrupt members, and that every portion of it which tolerated, or forgave those guilty of a grievous crime, had forfeited its claims. Protestanism is essentially Donatist, whether in its high-church theory of branch separation from the trunk, or in its lowest evangelical idea of an invisible elect church. Where was the confutation of this dangerous theory to be found? In the parables which we have arranged, with one more which follows them, and is but a confirmation of a preceding one: the likening of the kingdom of Heaven to a net gathering all sorts of fishes, which are separated only on the shore.* This, our Saviour, by mentioning the angels as the sorters of good and bad, clearly refers to the explanation given by Himself, of the parable of the cockle. To judge of the importance of these parables, on the point referred to, let the reader only open, at random, any of St. Augustine's works against the Donatists. He will hardly glance at a page in which he does not find these two parables quoted or alluded to, together with the similar image of the Baptist, that on the barn-floor the wheat and the chaff lie mixed, till the winnowing-time comes in the end.† "Novit Dominus triticum suum, novit et paleam," is almost a proverbial expression with that Father. He is never afraid of wearying by repeating the same arguments; these images are again and again quoted, are turned on every side, are alternately arguments fully developed, and illustrations to elucidate his own reasonings. But it is clear that in them lies the whole gist of the question; and that our Lord had carefully buried in them a seed of doctrine which would not reach its maturity till they who heard it had long passed away.

---

* Matt. xiii. 47.

† Ib. iii. 12; Luke iii. 17.

And now let us take another instance of parables seemingly spoken for a passing illustration; which yet have acquired a most sacred importance in the Church. One of the dangers to our Lord's disciples arose from the facility with which they would take up the tone of false zeal common in their time, and considered a characteristic of great virtue. For it is difficult for men, especially if untutored, to get clear of national characteristics. Symptoms of this soon appeared. There were little pharisaical contests for the first place, among those young children of the Gospel;* they soon got to wish for judgment upon those who resisted their master:† and they rebuked little ones who would approach Him, as they thought, over familiarly.‡ The Pharisees, it need not be added, only included our Saviour among those whom they despised, the sinners and publicans, because of His charity towards them. To each of these two classes, to His Apostles and to the proud Pharisees, He separately, as it would appear, proposed the same parable: that of the man who, having a hundred sheep, and losing one of them, leaves the ninety-nine in what we call the desert, that is, to use a corresponding English phrase, on the *Downs*, or an uninclosed range of hilly pasture-land, and goes to seek the lost one. In St. Matthew, this parable is given to show the value of the soul of the least child before God, in answer to one of the uneasy questions alluded to, put by the disciples. "At that hour the disciples came to Jesus, saying: Who thinkest Thou is the greatest in the kingdom of Heaven? And Jesus calling unto him a little child," etc. And so from the sin of scandalizing, or causing the loss of such a one, He proceeds to the earnest desire which God has of his salvation. Then comes the parable of the lost sheep, with this conclusion:—"Even so it is not the will of your Father who is in Heaven, that one of those little ones should perish."* In St. Luke, publicans and sinners have gathered round our Saviour, and the Pharisees murmur, saying:—"This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them." He replies by the same parable, with a different inference:—"Even so there shall be joy in Heaven upon one sinner that doth penance."† The parable, therefore, is primarily spoken to illustrate two points of immediate use:—1st, that His disciples, instead of striving for preëminence, and despising children, must take them as a model, as being the special favorites of Heaven, for whose safety God is as careful as a shepherd is of that of a stray sheep; and 2ndly, that as a lost sheep recovered is dearer to the shepherd than what are safe at home, so is a converted sinner more a cause of joy to heaven than many just souls. But no sooner has our blessed Lord elsewhere said, "I am the Good Shepherd,"* and in a different parable assumed all the characteristics of one, than these words touch with a ray of new light this parable, and present it to us in a far more tender and consoling form. We no longer look at the immediate application, or consider it as an illustration; it becomes a description of Himself, in His dealings with the Jews, and with each individual soul, with Magdalen, with Peter, with Saul, with every other penitent, down to the writer or reader of these lines. But how could proud Pharisee, or dull disciple, nay, or bright angel, unless foreknowledge be part of his light, have possibly understood the whole beauty, reality, and pathos of this parable, till the pursuit of the lost sheep had been made from Olivet to Zion, and from Zion to Calvary, and the stray one had been seen borne up the toiling ascent upon shoulders bruised beneath the cross's load? As long as the world shall last, that brief parable, which sounded at first but as a most apt figure of speech, will prove the consolation of many an aching breast, and the light of many a darkened spirit, and the inspirer of many a grateful thought.

---

* Luke xxii. 24.

† Ib. ix. 54.

‡ Matt. xix. 14; Luke xviii. 15.

---

* Matt. xviii. 1–14.

† Luke xv. 1–7.

---

* John x. 11.

But let us look at both these classes of parables, and we hesitate not to say, that only a Catholic can thoroughly realize them, or apply them. A Protestant may see in them just as much as the Jew did. He will understand, in the first class, how the Christian religion was a treasure, or a pearl, worth every sacrifice. But if he stands to his Homilies, or to the popular belief of his church, he must teach, not that the enemy sowed cockle or tares among Christ's wheat, but that the whole crop came to nothing; that much of the seed rotted from the beginning and brought up spurious plants, and that what sprung up soon cankered, turned sickly and died down to the root: so that the field showed little better than the high-road or the rock. For such would be the parable to correspond with the theory that all Christendom was for hundreds of years involved in idolatry. Then, if to get *some* Protestant church-theory out of the parable, it is supposed that the bad seed signifies error in doctrine as well as scandals in morals—so that the Church has to be a sort of confederation of all manner of sects: or, like Anglicanism, may permit peaceful existence in her of any amount of denominations or shades;—then, indeed, we go counter to historical realization of it. For the Church has ever repelled into antagonism every other system, and has refused any to coexist with her in the same field. Then we have the image of the tree springing up from one seed, which at once overthrows this theory. The idea of one tree from one root, with living coherence of all its branches with the trunk, is incapable of application, upon any other system than that of Catholic unity. It is easy then to see how the parables of our Lord, which describe the future Church, or any of its great characteristics, can only have their true meaning in Catholic hands, and only receive verification in our Church. And in the beautiful parable of the lost sheep, painful as it may be to say it, still we must not hesitate to assert it,—only a Catholic can feel its application. Others no doubt sin, and repent, and feel the sense (if their religious opinions guide them that way) of a forgiveness. Or a few, who mimic Catholic institutions, may seek forgiveness in a sham confession and hollow absolution—both uttered under the very shadow of an episcopal reproof. But a system of grace which, from first to last, by a certain working, brings home to the penitent sinner the lively assurance and sense that he has been mercifully followed through his wanderings, by a kind and steady friend: that he has been won back by gentleness; that there has been a delicate raising up of his heavy load, a caressing of his sickened heart, a mild soothening of his sorrows: that the thorns which had wound themselves around him as he wandered are not plucked, but picked from him with a dainty hand,

and every wound and every bruise searchingly and minutely probed, but only to be cleansed and closed and skilfully dressed; and that then he has been borne in arms like a babe back to his home; a system, or rather a power, of grace which makes him know the day and the hour and the very moment in which he is again God's child, that is to be found nowhere, yes nowhere, save only in the one true fold of God's Catholic Church. And do we want one short, convincing proof? Nowhere else is the banquet ever ready, at which the angels are invited to rejoice for the lost sheep found. Nowhere else is communion considered, or given, as the pledge of a sinner's repentance. His heart may be full of contrition and sorrow, but he may wait many months before his minister shall think that this is a ground for an extra communion-day in the parish: but in the Catholic Church he bounds, at once, full of love, to the banquet; from Magdalen's place at the feet, to John's on the bosom, of Jesus.

If this fulfilment be the result of a dispensation in the Church, this parable creates a not less perfect counterpart by its moral application. How the early Christians loved this image! How they sculptured it on their tombs, painted it in their catacomb oratories, enamelled it on their glass! The type of their Lord as the Good Shepherd, with the wayward sheep upon His shoulders, oh! how it spoke to their hearts of the mercies of their conversion! How tender a treatment of the sinner, to represent him as the sheep, the very kin of the Lamb of God! Then how natural that an institution founded for reclaiming and saving souls that have gone the most fearfully astray, should take the same emblem and the same name. It keeps ever before the thoughts of those holy religious who adopt it, the charity with which their duties are to be practised, and the gentleness with which those bruised souls are to be handled. In other instances and ways do the parables, so easy of adaptation in the Catholic mind, influence the institutions and the language of the Church. To call the duties of the ministry the "labors or the cultivation of the vineyard," to speak of the clergy as "husbandmen," simply *operarii*, and above all to give familiarly the name of shepherd or pastor to the bishop, more perhaps in other countries that in ours, are modes of speech most common among Catholics, but scarcely so, we believe, among even Anglicans. This trifling circumstance shows how the parables fit into our system, as we have before observed.

And as we have alluded to the application made by our Lord to Himself of the image of the Good Shepherd, we will observe that as He is the model of pastors, the characteristics which He so justly assumes to Himself, must be considered as those at which inferior shepherds of souls should aim. Now this again is practical to a Catholic mind, even in that hard duty of being ready to lay down life for the sheep. Protestantism has had its pretended martyrs; the Church of England numbers bishops among them; Cranmer and

Ridley for example. But can it be for a moment pretended that they, or any of their fellows, laid down their lives for their flocks—threw themselves generously between their people and iniquity, and became a willing sacrifice? But our own St. Thomas, and the late Archbishop of Paris, and St. Stanislaus, and St. John Nepomucen (though not a bishop), and many others, fulfilled this to the letter. And the number is still greater of those who have shown themselves ready to make the sacrifice.

It will be seen, by what we have written, that we consider the parable-teaching of our Lord as mainly embodying doctrines or precepts, belonging to the Church about to be established. This is in fact our idea; and we think it susceptible of being pursued still further. Speaking, of course, not so much of the passing, short, proverbial illustrations, or of such comparisons as are merely explanatory, with both which every discourse of our Lord is enriched, as of set and formal parables, there is a striking difference to be traced in the different gospels, between the selections made by each. It will be seen, we think, that St. Matthew, who writes for the Jews, and whose main drift is to show them how Christianity had to supersede their religion, has recorded, almost exclusively, parables that illustrate this point. His parables relate to the rejection of the Jews, in order to make way for Christianity. In addition to the series of parables in this thirteenth chapter, which we have already quoted, and which all go to inculcate the importance of embracing the new religion, the following are the principal ones: indeed all which occur in him, as spoken to the Jews. 1. The laborers in the vineyard, of whom those called at the end of the day were made equal to such as had been there all day; that is, the Gentiles were put on a level with the Jews.* 2. The two sons sent to work, one of whom pretended to go, and did not—the Jews again—the other demurred, but went; that is, publicans and sinners, who should go before them into the Church.† 3. The vineyard, let out to husbandmen who gave no return, but persecuted their master's messengers and servants, and slew his son; for which the vineyard was to be given to other husbandmen,—a parable so plain in its application, that "when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard His parables [this and the preceding], they understood that He spake of them."‡ 4. The marriage feast, the first invited guests to which were rejected in favor of the poor from the waysides,—no bad image of the despised Gentiles.§ The parables of ten virgins, five of whom were rejected, and of the ten talents, were indeed addressed to the disciples privately; but both, and the latter in particular, will apply to the purpose above intimated,—the rejection of those who had neglected profitably to use the advantages committed to them.* And of such, the principal were most certainly the Jews. It can hardly be doubted that all these parables were purposely selected out of the many which Christ spake, to prove St. Matthew's particular point. They become, as it were, the key to his whole Gospel; and when we look also at the very discourse with the disciples in which the two last-mentioned parables occur, and see that its whole subject is the destruction of Jerusalem, and when further we compare the detail with which the Evangelist gives our Lord's noble and vehement declamation against the hypocrisy of the scribes and Pharisees, in his twenty-third chapter, and his full record of the Sermon on the Mount, in which the Jewish moral law is superseded, and the modern deformations of it are swept away, like cobwebs, from the sanctuary, we find that St. Matthew's Gospel bears intrinsic evidence of having been written with the view of proclaiming, to his countrymen, the overthrow of Judaism.

---

* xx. 1.

† xxi. 28.

‡ Ib. 45.

§ xxii. 2.

But while this scope may be discovered in the special parables which he has preserved for us, these no less belong, in many of their features, to the Church, and, in those parts, could not have been fully understood by the Jews. To take one example; the parable of the marriage feast clearly enough told the Pharisees that they had refused the invitation to God's banquet, and that those whom they heartily despised and hated had been called in their place. But what follows after is not for them. The man of the second party, who appears unrobed for the feast, and is cast forth, represents one already a Christian, unworthy of his profession, who is to be no less punished than they. How could they see the force of this declaration? It is for us. But then, in the eyes of the Christian, the whole scene changes. The parable represents to him the Church or kingdom of God, not in its wider and external aspect, but in that which belongs to the children alone of the Kingdom. The Jewish view can only reach the outer wall which shuts it out. The Church within shows to us, not a system of dry faith and precepts, but a banqueting-hall, full of domestic joy and peace, and wherein God hath spread out a table ever furnished. Interior unity, the being one house, one family, one body, symbolizes itself in this form. The kingdom of God is to us a feast—nay, *the* feast; and we can no more realize the thought of practical warm religion, in disconnection with the eucharistic banquet and sacrifice, than we can think of home without a hearth, or of a family without a common table. The Church is not merely a teaching, but a feasting place: not a lecture-room, but a banqueting-hall. And which Church exclusively is this? Enter the Catholic church (the type of the Church in the abstract), and you find not only always a table, but, if one may speak in so homely a way, a table with the cloth spread, which tells you that to-day there has been already a feast, and to morrow there will be another, and the day after, as there was yesterday. If a Catholic found it otherwise, if he saw the altar uncovered and naked, and its furniture removed, and its tabernacle, in which the feast lies ever prepared, open and empty, he would conclude at once that the place was not in use; that, in fact, it is not actually used as *a Church:* he cannot dissociate the two—the Church and the feast. Where else is this to be found? In the meeting-house, we trow, the pulpit reminds one not of feasts. And in an establishment-church, though the piscina may have been restored, and two new oak carved chairs may be beside the communion-table, *this* is but as a piece of furniture covered up when the family is from home. Nor can we believe that in the mind of an average churchman there is any obvious and natural connection between his religion and the communion-table; nor that, by any instinctive association, does he think of the latter when he speaks of "going to church." No one, we again repeat, can fully realize this parable but a Catholic. For, as our Saviour spake it to the Jews, of His kingdom, consequently of the Church, it is to this it must be applied. But when applied as by a Catholic heart it necessarily is, every part is coherent, the figure is perfect, and the details full of beauty and instruction. It associates two ideas, those of the Church and of the Eucharist, which, in him alone, are almost correlative. And thus only is the problem solved, how wonderfully a parable spoken of the one can so beautifully apply to the other.

---

* xxv. 1, 14.

St. Mark agrees with St. Matthew in this, as in other respects, and therefore does not call for any particular remark here. But when we come to study St. Luke, we find, through his parables, a different purpose and scope in his Gospel. He is not engaged with the Jews, nor endeavoring to root out their prejudices, and prove to the converts from them, that their religion and state have passed away. He writes for the Greek or the Hellenist converts, for those who have less difficulty on that point; and therefore his object is to place before them the high standard morality of Christ, and exhibit the beauty of His religion, by its influence on the character and nature of man. With St. Matthew, he has parables in common; as the sower, the hundred sheep, the vineyard and husbandmen, and the marriage feast. The parables of the mustard-seed, and leaven, also he has, but not as in a series relating to the Church.[*] But the following beautiful parables are exclusively his: 1. The good Samaritan;[†] 2. the Prodigal child;[‡] 3. the unjust steward;[§] 4. Dives and Lazarus;[‖] 5. the Pharisee and the Publican;[¶] 6. and that short, but most sweet of parables, of the two servants forgiven by their master, and proportioning their love to his kindness, His pleading for Mary Magdalen to the Pharisee.() And it must be observed, that many of these are not spoken in answer to questions, but are direct and spontaneous emanations of the divine wisdom in Jesus Christ; consequently, must be considered as intended to convey great and complete lessons. In fact, if we attentively consider them in the order in which we have enumerated them, we shall find them to contain the whole theory of the following practical points: —1. Active fraternal charity in its perfection; 2. the whole history of the sinner's fall, return, and forgiveness; 3. the duty of alms-deeds, and its motives; 4. the vital and fundamental principle of man's end, and of the use and worth of creatures; and the consequences of rightly or wrongly acting on that principle;* 5. the complete doctrine of prayer;† and 6. the true character and motives of repentance, and the right principle of forgiveness and justification.

---

[*] Luke xiii.

[†] Ib. x. 30.

[‡] Ib. xv. 11.

[§] Luke xvi.

[‖] Ib. 19.

[¶] Ib. xviii. 10.

() Ib. vii. 40.

Before we enter into any details on any of these points, we must observe that still these parables refer to the visible and practical duties and morality in the Church. They represent courses of action, principles embodied in practice: they include the inward animating motives, or impulses of grace that guide them, as descriptions of the actions of the body suppose corresponding wishes, or thoughts, of the soul within. To another evangelist belongs the higher office of describing the direct and invisible influences of grace. But these parables, in general, contain new principles of action, and describe a course of proceeding which could not be understood fully in the old dispensation, and have reference to what was to be developed in the new. And although some of them, as referring to moral duties, may appear as applicable in one form of Christianity as in another, yet it is not so. There is hardly one of them which does not contain an idea incompatible with Protestantism. For example, the publican standing "afar off" in his prayer in the temple:—From what is he afar off? The Catholic says at once from the altar, of course, at the very bottom of the Church; and, if better instructed, he will add, "and where, in accordance with this feeling, the early Church put penitents, and penitential pilgrims would now kneel." The Protestant would say, "The parable has reference to the temple, and not to a Christian Church." Then which *realizes* the parable? But if he thinks it may be applied to our times so materially, being a high-churchman; we ask,—*Do* penitents in his church stand, through reverence, far away from the altar on a common day?—is that natural to them? It is to us. And why? Because the Catholic has, more than in the temple, a Holy of Holies on his altar, in the Blessed Eucharist: while the Protestant communion-table, when it has reached its highest aim, bears only a cross and a pair of candlesticks;

---

* The entire principle of St. Ignatius's *Exercises* is to be found in this parable.

† With the parable immediately preceding it, of the unjust judge, overcome by the widow's importunity (v. 2).

the emblems at most, one of a possible image, the others of a suppressed or prevented light. Again, the parable of the unjust steward contains the idea of intercession by those in heaven: evade it, and you destroy its completeness. The parable in favor of Mary Magdalen is expressly directed to prove that love, and not mere faith, is the groundwork of contrition; and it shows the merit and value of outward acts exhibiting sorrow, and the wish for pardon, tears, penance, satisfaction, all approved of; as well as an outward declaration of pardon.

The parable of the prodigal would require more space than we can give it; but we do not hesitate to say, that its beauties cannot be fully seen, except by a Catholic eye. Who but a Catholic can trace the exact parallel between the father's house, and the religious child's home in the Church? Who but one familiar with the tale of many sinners, opening their hearts to him, can track every step of others' wanderings; can thus tell to many a startled hearer his own sad history, or rather tell the prodigal's, so as that it shall be a mirror before him, and make him taste his own heart as bitter as the acorn? And if we have thus roused him to return towards his early home, where, out of the Church, is to be found the warm embrace, the self-accusation made indeed, but almost stifled in the caresses of forgiveness? Where the robe of grace, the ring of filial adoption, the shoes of strengthening encouragement? Where, above all, the feast of joy, not merely of refreshment, prepared to welcome him? Is all this minute, and most natural, and most cheering detail, but superfluous dressing out of a most simple idea, that by an inward act, there was sudden conviction of sin, and a sense of forgiveness? Or does it signify that still inwardly, a man repented him of his ways, and perhaps shed silent tears over the past, and resolved amendment; or perhaps even applied to himself the general absolution in the morning service: or if he went to his rector and told him what he felt and had determined, was told, "he was glad to hear it, and hoped there would now be less poaching in the neighborhood." But trifling apart, there is not a parish priest, nor a missionary, nor a spiritual director, who could not give twenty cases of conversion in which the parallel with the prodigal's history is most complete: and there is not a penitent in the Church who could not say, that from his first departure from virtue to the communion that crowned his conversion, he had seen and felt, in acts and sensible ministrations, and their effects, all that is so minutely described by our Lord.

But while we have thus claimed for the Catholic Church alone the power fully to appreciate our divine Lord's parables, by entirely realizing them, we have, we trust, prepared the ground for another conclusion. It may be observed, that truth presents us ever with two classes of evidence. The first consists of the great and direct proofs on which it rests; the second, of those innumerable and unprepared convergences of argument that meet in it from various points. The former will bring us to the truth; but the latter often more sensibly secure our conviction. The one is as the trunk of the plant, the other as the suckers and tendrils, which lay hold on every side of various and effectual support, and will often prevent the plant from being overthrown by a sudden gust. Now we think that even so slight and superficial a view as we have here had an opportunity of presenting, of the parables, may contribute somewhat towards these minor evidences, in favor of our faith.

For, surely, it must afford our minds considerable satisfaction to find how, in our religion, and in no other, this part of our Saviour's teaching is fully carried out. It has been by other means that we have been brought to a distinct conception and belief of dogma: by the plain texts of the Old and New Testaments, by the teaching of our Redeemer, and that of His apostles: by the concurring testimony of antiquity, and the living voice of the Church. When from all these a system has resulted, of the Church, its government, its characters, its duties, its sacraments, its connection with the world and with time, boldly clear, and definite; and when, taking this more obscure part of our Lord's instructions, and analyzing it, we find it fit this view exclusively and in every part, we must conclude that they were made for one another,—this Church and the series of parables, and that both come from one hand. It is like experiments in magnetism coming to corroborate the Newtonian theory.

But there is a higher thought to which these our poor inquiries have led us; and we trust it will not be deemed presumptuous. Our blessed Lord speaks His parables off-hand, if we may reverently use the word; with reference often to passing demands on His instruction. Even they who have impiously pretended that the whole Gospel was an after-thought, and the composition of disciples in early ages, must admit at least, that the record of these parables is far anterior to the age when Catholicity (according to them) took its present development. How then account for the coincidence of the two in every part? Let us observe that the marvellous structure of Christianity was from its foundations without a formal plan: its laws were embodied in no stiff code: its government was not defined in one formal decree; its doctrines were not compressed into a symbol; and its precepts and maxims were not extended into a treatise. Nor were men chosen to raise the edifice, who, from scattered materials, were likely to compile a beautiful and perfect whole. Yet this was the result. Stone joined itself to stone, as if by instinct, or mutual attraction; the whole building stood, as if by magic, weather-tight, massive, solid, yet regular, rich, and magnificent. Government, law, faith, morals, discipline, all were found to have been provided for; and as it grew and extended on every side, ample provision appeared to have been made for its increase, in regard both of plan and of materials. And so it expanded still until some thought that it had outgrown its measure and original design. In all this, who does not see proof of a divine wisdom that designed and superintended the work? But let us suppose even, that our Lord left, as some would say, the details of the system to natural causes and the working of time; that He merely put together the main lines, and allowed them to be filled up; or that even, upon a Protestant theory, the corruptions and superstitions of ages have shaped the Catholic Church as it now is —still, in every hypothesis the fact is the same, and will go far to overthrow the erroneous supposition. Whatever led to the Church's present organization and development, it is plain that Christ's parables, that have reference to it, or his workings, fit exactly to it, as it is. Call confession an abuse, a mistake, or what you like, there is nothing else on earth that will make the close of the prodigal's history look like a lesson or a home-truth. Then our Saviour foresaw all this, and provided for it its rules and principles; and He who could cast into the world but the rudimental forms of a religion, and yet throw out, in a mysterious form, what would describe its state, and regulate its institutions, after a thousand years, and more, of vicissitudes, could be only what He claimed to be, the Lawgiver himself, the supreme Author of the new Law, the incarnate Word of God. And that system with which His prophetic teaching so approvingly accords can be no delusion, or corruption of men.

Still further to bring out this argument, let us remark the immensely superior position which He takes, compared on the one side with the prophets, and, on the other, with the apostles. The prophet who deals most largely in parables, partly spoken, and partly acted, is undoubtedly Ezekiel. But he, like all the other prophets, never presumes to deliver one as from himself. It is always a command from God, both parable and application. On the other hand, the apostles in their writings constantly appeal to their having been taught, having received their doctrine. They also make use of phrases of exhortation; and give advice. Now our Redeemer always speaks the parable as His own, and gives us His own, and no other authority. Yet these parables contain modifications of the old law, declare the rejection of the Jews, or rather pronounce sentence of it, give the terms of forgiveness from God, define the duties of the new religion, promulgate the new law; and often, as if to contrast with the prophetic declaration of dependence, "thus saith the Lord," these definite declarations are supported by "Amen, *I* say to you." Considering that the *nearer* one comes to God, and the greater consequently perfection, the stronger will be the sense of dependence, and the humble consciousness of the honor of such service; as Raphael with Tobias,* Gabriel with Mary,† the angel with St. John,‡ more explicitly even than the prophets, declared themselves only messengers of God, we cannot admit even one step of separation between the Divinity and Him who "thought it not robbery to be equal to God."§ And as to the second comparison, it must certainly be considered remarkable that not once throughout the Gospels is the word "exhort" used, except once in St. Luke, of the preaching of St. John.‖ And this is to be the more noticed, as it is a word of frequent use by the same evangelist, in his Acts of the Apostles. Our Lord always commands, and leaves no alternative but obedience. He gives not advice, which supposes only partial knowledge: but He enjoins one, and only one, course. And this it was which really constituted, as we before hinted, our Lord's teaching "with power;" that is, as having dominion over the law itself, as possessed of inherent and rightful jurisdiction.

---

* Tob. xii. 18. † Luke i. 28.
‡ Apoc. xix. 10; xxii. 9. § Philip. ii. 6. ‖ Luke iii. 18.

We fear we shall be considered to have indulged in a long digression; and, in truth, we must beg our reader to carry his memory back to where we enumerated, and commented briefly on, the parables in St. Luke. We there did not make any remarks upon undoubtedly the most perfect in structure, and the most beautiful in substance, of all the parables, unless that of the prodigal may dispute equality. We allude to that of the good Samaritan. We then purposely omitted any remarks on it, because we reserved it for this place. It will better illustrate all that we wish to convey, respecting the application of parables, than any observations of ours can do it. If we have not already exhausted our reader's patience, we will request him to follow us into some detail.

1. Let him read the parable as in St. Luke's tenth chapter; and that will save him, and us, the task of a narration. But we may be allowed, in a few words, to point out some circumstances which, to the hearers, must have invested it with additional interest. Our Lord lays the scene of it between Jerusalem and Jericho. Now the latter name does not signify the moon, as some tell us, but alludes to the sweet odor of the balsam-plant, there chiefly cultivated. The Arabic name, at this day, *Rihha*, confirms this derivation. Considerable intercourse existed in consequence, between it and the capital, distant a day's journey. But our Saviour placed the scene of the parable on the road between them, because it was notorious for being

infested with robbers. It is as if one, writing in the last century, had put it on Hounslow-heath. The robbers of Palestine have always been the same;—armed bands of desperate men, or tribes of Bedouins,* who are prepared for any violence, even where there is no resistance. One who heard our Lord deliver His parable, and who knew the road, would have the spot at once before his mind's eye. It was just between seven and eight miles from Jerusalem. It is the critical spot now, as it was then, for the East changes but little. In St. Jerome's time it was the same; and the very name which the place bore indicated its character. It was called, he tells us, *Maledommim*,† that is, "the assault, or rising up, of the Idumeans," to which nation possibly many of these marauders belonged. Where the mode of travelling does not change, the length of a day's journey, and the distances for repose remain almost unvaried. Hence inns will be found for whole centuries on the same spot. In Italy this is certainly the case, as it was in old times in England. And in the East, where changes happen so much less than in Europe, it will be still more so. The pace of the ass or the camel has not varied; and they are still the beasts of travel. At the present time there is, or there was, not many years ago, a khan or inn, not far from the spot thus indicated in the parable. And so faithful has tradition been, and so deeply has our Saviour's beautiful lesson impressed itself on "the very ground, that this hostelry is known by the name of the khan of the good Samaritan."* But there are two more reasons for the choice of this place. The first is, that Jericho, after Jerusalem, was the great station of the priests and Levites, who came in turns to Jerusalem, to serve the temple. The body of the priests, the Jewish writers tell us, was divided into twenty-four classes, twelve of which were stationed at Jericho. Each class comprehended Levites.† It would, therefore, be most natural that men of this profession, not usually great travellers, should be found on that road. And on the day when a priest had to pass from one city to the other, it is most probable that a Levite likewise entered on, or left, duty; and travelled at a respectful distance from his superior, but near enough to have the protection of his escort or retinue. Hence the priest passes first, and then the Levite; contrary to the order in which, to show their inefficiency, we might have expected them to come on the stage. The second reason for the choice of place is, that Jericho is on the way from Samaria to Jerusalem, not straight across, but according to the line of public roads. Business, therefore, may have brought a Samaritan on that road, perhaps the only one in all Judea.

---

* St. Jerome, on Jer. iii. 2, observes, that by the robbers in the wilderness, there mentioned, "may be understood the Arabs, which nation, given to marauding, yet infests the boundaries of Palestine, and besets the roads leading from Jerusalem to Jericho."

† St. Jerome, after Eusebius, translates it by *ἀνάβασις πυῤῥών*, understanding by the second word, men *red* with blood. (*De Situ et Nom. Loc. Heb.*) At a later period a station of soldiers was placed near, to protect travellers. See also on the insecurity of this neighborhood, Buckingham's Travels among the Arab Tribes, p. 5.

---

* Mariti, Viaggi per l' Isola di Cipro, e per la Soria, e Palestina, vol. iii. cap. 6.

† Talm. H. Taanith. fol. 27.

We can easily imagine how graphic and vivid the parable, *improvised* so completely in answer to a petulant question, "who is my neighbor?" must have sounded to persons, who at once caught the propriety and nice fit of every minute circumstance in its recital. But every other detail is the same. A traveller on horseback and alone would not be likely, among us, to have in his scanty baggage, salves and medicines; but fortunately in the east, what was provision for food, was considered the best dressing for wounds and bruises. The inns of Asia furnish nothing but shelter; the traveller must take care to bring his own provisions; two of the most indispensable were oil for condiment, and wine for drink. The Samaritan came from the country where both were of the best quality,—in the land of Samaria the one,* and on the sea coast, from Carmel to Saron, the other. He was likely, therefore, to have brought his flask of each, for his own use. Now wine and oil were a common medicament with the Jews. We will quote their words, because they will show how justly, on other occasions, our Saviour declaimed against their absurd splitting of hairs, and sabbatarian uncharitableness. "An old tradition hath, it is not lawful, for the sake of a sick man, to mingle oil and wine together on the sabbath day." Again, "They spread a plaster for a sick man on the Sabbath. When? when they mix it up with wine and oil on the eve of the Sabbath. But if they did not mix it on the eve, it is forbidden."* What wonder that the men who thought it better to let a sick man die, than prepare his medicine on a Sabbath, should easily have found excuses for not taking one up on the roadside? The circumstance, therefore, of the Samaritan's dressing the poor traveller's wounds, is quite natural, and the ingredients of his application are necessarily with him.

---

* "Oleum. . . . . . pretiosissimum missum est ab Ephraim, cujus terra Samaria olei feracissima est."—S. Hieron. in Os. xii. 1.

The last point to which we will advert, is one which often spoils the recital of the parable. The Samaritan is said, upon delivering his charge to the host, "to take out twopence," and give them with these words: "Take care of him, and whatsoever thou shalt spend over and above, I, at my return, will repay thee" (v. 35). This seems to us but a paltry sum, and certainly if one made such an offer as this sounds to us, at the Star and Garter, or even a small roadside inn, it would be looked at with amazement. But the fault lies in the translation. Unfortunately a *denarius* has got translated *penny*: but without going into any learned discussion on its value, it is sufficient for us to say that it was a man's good wages for a day's work at that time. For, the laborers in the vineyard were satisfied with it for the whole day, till they saw that the same was given to those that entered at the eleventh hour.[*] The sum given was therefore enough to keep the patient two days; and when we consider that the Samaritan was only seven miles from Jerusalem, to which he was going,[†] and might be returning in the course of next day, we shall not be surprised at the amount of the advance.

---

* Shabbat, fol. 134, Berachoth. fol. 3, ap. Wetst. *in loc.*

---

[*] Matt. xx. 13. In the Apocalypse, famine prices are thus given :—"Two pounds of wheat for a penny (a *denarius*), and thrice two pounds of barley for a penny" (vi. 6). We may remark that the difference of price between wheat and barley, as here given, is as one to three: whereas in the famine in Samaria the proportions were one to two. (4 Reg. vii. 1.) It is difficult to adjust the proportions of measures and values at different times, because coins and measures vary. The following varieties appear incredible; but we give them to show how much could be done, at times, for a *penny*. In the Chronicle of Josue Stylites we learn that, at Edessa, in 495, thirty bushels of wheat, and fifty of barley, could be purchased for a *denarius*. (Assem. Bib. Or. tom. i. p. 261.) Later the prices were four of wheat and six of barley (p. 271), and immediately prices fell again, and were, twelve measures of wheat and twenty-two of barley for a *denarius* (p. 272).

[†] This appears from the difference of the expressions; the priest and Levite were going "the same way" as the traveller (vv. 30, 31), while the Samaritan is "on his journey" (v. 33), and speaks of returning, which intimates going *from* home, consequently towards Jerusalem. The image is thus most

2. This parable, then, in its *materiality* is perfect; every part is most exact. And what a variety of important lessons it contains. First it effectually answers the impertinent question proposed, "Who is my neighbor?" Secondly, it conveys a most mild, but tremendous, rebuke to the proud interrogator: for it tells him that a Samaritan knew better the meaning of a precept of law than a Jewish doctor. Thirdly, it gives a lesson of practical charity, without reference to creed or nation; a doctrine totally at variance with that principle which dispenses charity to the perishing by hunger and disease only on condition of their renouncing their faith.

3. But who has ever read this parable and not recognized in it the history of the world, and understood that Jesus Christ was the Good Samaritan described in it? Now this is in fact the grand aspect of this splendid composition. It would be impossible in fewer words to make a sketch of the whole history of man from his fall, to his complete regeneration and preservation. It is masterly in every way, the strokes few, the masses simple and grand, and yet detailed so as to give them definiteness and character. Could man's fall be more accurately pictured than by a traveller (the *homo*

happy; the priest is one who walks in the same direction as the wounded man, of the same country and religion; the Samaritan is one who goes opposite to them.

viator of the schools) assailed by an enemy, robbed of everything, wounded all over, naked, half dead, helpless, unable to move? And now comes the priest, the type of every system of previous religion,—of Noah's, Melchisedec's; nay, of Egypt's, India's, Greece's, false worship. They all recognized in man the bruised and fallen type of a better state; but they neither cured nor raised him. Then follows the Levite, a title which specifies what before was generic; the law and priesthood of the Old Testament, still better informed of man's history, but as unable to succor him. At length comes the Samaritan, the stranger to man's race. Thus far an intelligent Jew might follow: but beyond this he would be at fault. Recognizing in Christ this character, he would ask, How does *He* intend to bind those wounds? What oil and wine has He that will stanch the bleeding gashes of humanity? How will he bear the burden on His shoulders, of that prostrate frame of a whole gasping race? Was it possible for the most learned to solve this problem? Not till fulfilment had taken place of those awful realities which were to give as truthful a counterpart of this portion of the parable as existed in the other parts; and not even then, till the full system of the atonement was preached to him, and he understood that by *His* wounds ours were healed, and that He verily bore the iniquities of us all. And thus much further, though not completely, can the Protestant pursue the parable; but not beyond this. We say not completely, for the sacramental nature of the remedies escapes him. The wine he will know; but what is the oil, which has ceased to have all meaning in the Protestant system? It anoints him not, regenerated, into part with a kingly priesthood; nor, a stripling descending into the lists, to do battle with unearthly foes; nor a priest into an inviolable consecration; nor a worn-out pilgrim for his last wrestling with the giant Despair. With him it has no symbolism; it represents not to him the light of God's sanctuary, nor the *unction* of His word, nor the balmy softness (the *oleum effusum*) of two Names most sweet in Catholic mouths. It rises not to his mind with the thought of virginity, anointed with the oil of gladness above its fellow-orders of holiness. It lingers not, as a holy seal, upon the stones of his altar, after ages of desecration in the wall of the old church, to tell whose once it was. It has vanished from his system, and together with it all uplifting of the priestly hand to bless. Consecration of man or thing he has lost, and knows no more. But oil, the emblem of all consecration, and of sacramental grace, and wine, the purest symbol of the saving stream of life, and of its sacramental in-pouring into man, form, to the Catholic mind, the most apt imaginable representation of the communication, to his wounded nature, of new health, new vigor, new life.

But as we before observed, but one step beyond the Jew's apprehension of this parable, Protestantism stops. Man, rescued from total death, is, according to strict Protestant doctrine, left to himself, and to his own judgment, to make the best of his way home. The good Samaritan leaves no vicarious authority on earth, to whom He fully and unreservedly commits the charge of him, and who has to carry out his work. The cure was complete when he had touched, and there was no one to bind up anew the sores, should they re-open, or to supply refreshment if the patient should faint. But the Catholic sees here to the end, every part fulfilled. The good Samaritan has gone on in His journey, and is not yet returned: we wait His coming at the end of ages. And man, though the death-wound is healed, and life secured, remains still but a weak and sickly creature, and has no food of his own, and no remedy, but what that compassionate stranger has left behind. But he has left it and him in good and faithful hands. Still requiring support, still in the pupilage of an impaired mind, still with the plague of recrudescent wounds, he feels with thankfulness that, till his best friend comes again to lead him home, he has been committed to those that have received the strictest charge to give a good account of him, and have been amply provided with present means, and secured by ampler promises for any outlay. A hostelry indeed it is—that stately Church of Christ—that Khan of the good Samaritan—for there is no lasting dwelling, no home for any one, this way to Jerusalem. Only pilgrims travel it. But how just a type: a house which is not our home, where we are only wayfarers seeking an enduring city, yet where we find rest, food, comfort, medicine, strength, at the sole charge of Him who has snatched us from destruction and healed our wounds. Not from some one chance inmate of the house, who is but a servant there for a time, but from *the house* itself; always the same, whoever rules it; always the same, and the same to all. Surely no Church but the Catholic inspires her children with the feeling, that they are under this particular and certain care. It is the very contradictory of the theory of private judgment.

4. And now let us see where the practical lesson of the parable is understood, and followed. Is it in poor-law relief, or in charitable associations, and mendicity societies, or in tract-distributing, domiciliary visits? Surely not. We have heard of a charitable society in London, called a "Samaritan Society;" which, a short time ago, busied itself very laudably with furnishing the dwellings of the poor with Arnold's ventilators. Very properly, certainly; but not very appropriately for their name. Noah's opening the window at the top of the ark, when the deluge was over, would have been a fitter symbol for this peculiar operation of charity. But go to the *Caridad* at Seville, and see that painting by Murillo, of one, not tricked out in ideal beauty, but humble, earnest, and busy with his toil—the bearing of a sinking, helpless, body to the hospital: with an angel at his side, that seems as if he felt honored in supporting him. That is

a Catholic Samaritan—St. John of God. Or see him at Grenada, amid the blazing hospital, lifting and carrying into safety, one by one, its numerous patients. Go to the frozen wilderness of Mount St. Bernard, and visit those men who have chosen it for their dreary abode, solely that they may be able to rescue the perishing traveller from the snow-wreath, or the precipice, and bear him to their house for Christ's sake, and warm, and restore him. Aye, and they have even, in the ingenuity of their charity, engrafted their Samaritan spirit upon canine instincts; and have taught their mute, faithful allies, to wander forth in the dark night and listen, amid the howling blast, for the wail of the lost traveller; and having found him, warm him with their breath, and refresh him with their ready store, and lead, or even if young, bear him, with wagging tail and glistening eye, as a prize beyond the hare or the partridge. Go to every quarter of the globe and see the sister of charity, serving the sick and the wounded with her own hands, and hushing the old veteran that moans in his pain, as though he were an infant, and soothing more suffering by the gentle speech of her lips, or the crucifix in her hand, than surgeon's skill or apothecary' s ointment can ever do. These are the copies of the good Samaritan, which the Catholic Church exhibits, without going back to those ages when charity itself imbibed the knightly spirit, and the hospitaller of St. John was not more ready to strike home for Christ's sepulchre than to bear his vanquished foe to the ready ward, and there nurse him like a brother; and without recurring to that more recent exhibition of the same spirit, when the ransomer, with our Lord's cross upon his breast, gave himself in pledge, or in exchange, for the captive slave in Barbary.

5. And now it is time to ask, what manner of wisdom that was, which indited so perfect, so grand, and so sweet a lesson? The most practised philosopher could not have struck of in a moment, a more complete summary of the moral history of the human race, or a truer picture of man's fallen condition. Nor can we imagine any man, however gifted, presuming to speculate on the effects of his own death upon the whole world; and to put himself forward as destined to regenerate it by ignominious suffering. And still less could any man have darted his eye so deeply into futurity as to sketch out accurately a system resulting from that event as it would remain after hundreds of years, for carrying out and applying the fruits of his sacrifice. In the few lines which record this parable, we have a strong and irrefragable proof of our Lord's divine character.

We must, however, hasten to a conclusion. We have endeavored to show that St. Matthew's parables are chosen in accordance with his natural purpose in writing for the Jews,—that of showing them that the old law had given place to, or had been absorbed in, the new: and that St. Luke's are addressed more towards forming the moral character of the Church already established. Both direct their records towards the outward mould of the Church, and her exterior offices: towards the Church, that is, as symbolizing our Lord's Sacred Humanity. The Gospel of St. John presents a different character. The Church is now fully formed, and the walls have been built all round her, which separate God's vineyard from profane ground. The first sprouting of error makes its appearance among the chosen plants. A gospel is wanted for the interior of the house, for those to whom Jesus would not speak in parables.

This difference between St. John's Gospel and the other three, may not have struck every reader. But it is remarkable that in St. John there are only three passages approaching to parables,* which yet essentially differ from those of the other gospels. For the three instances are those in which our Lord compares Himself to a door, and a vine;† and where he describes Himself as the Good Shepherd.‡ In no other parable is He one term of the comparison: and we may say, without danger of error, that these three comparisons of Himself to other objects ought hardly to be called parables. At any rate they form a separate class.

---

* Unless we reckon the passage in iv. 35, pointing out the fields as white for the harvest, which is rather an illustration than a parable.

† John x. 1; xv. 1. In the first of these our Lord first makes a parable, but immediately applies it to Himself. The second was addressed to the apostles alone.

‡ x. 11.

Now what makes this peculiarity of St. John more striking is, that he clearly intimates to us that our Saviour's habitual teaching was in parables. After His last supper He says to His apostles, " These things I have spoken to you in proverbs. The hour cometh when I will no more speak to you in proverbs."* And the apostles soon after reply to Him, " Behold now Thou speakest plainly, and speakest no proverb."† These passages express that our Lord's habitual teaching had been proverbial, or in parables; and yet, had St. John's Gospel alone been written, we should not have discovered this. They prove to us, therefore, that St. John supposed, or knew, other records to be in the hands of his readers, from which the nature and truth of this allusion would be manifest. These texts refer more to the other Gospels than to his own: and they form one of those delicate connecting links, which associate the four Gospels, as forming one record.

We may naturally ask, Why did St. John select those discourses of Christ which were free from parables? If we might venture to answer without presumption, it is because our Saviour Himself divided His teaching into two portions. So long as He treated of the Church, its duties and its vicissitudes, in other words, so long as He spoke of what was to be external, and one day historical, but, when He spoke, had only existence in prophecy, He employed what we have seen to compose the prophetic element of the New Testament,—parabolic teaching. But when He spoke of what already *was*, HIMSELF, His own existence previous even to Abraham, His coequality with the Father, His own Divinity, He shunned all parable, and spoke plainly and distinctly. St. John's office was to treasure up this second series of instructions, for the confutation of nascent errors, and the orthodox teaching of the whole Church.

---

* John xvi. 25.

† Ib. 29.

Hence, wherever he touches upon a matter already treated in the other Gospels, we shall find that, while they record for us what relates to its external forms or administration, that is, its body, St. John only preserves the discourse which describes its interior and more spiritual functions, that is, its soul. For instance, St. Matthew had fully preserved for us the institution of Baptism, and its form: St. John manifests to us in the conversation with Nicodemus, the invisible agency of the Holy Spirit, and the inward regeneration by the outward action.* Again the three first evangelists had carefully described the institution of the B. Eucharist: St. John passes over this, but has secured to us that invaluable discourse in his sixth chapter in which the union with Christ, the immortality, and the inward life bestowed by that holiest of sacraments, are so consolingly described. St. John's office, then, seems to be to manifest to us what our Redeemer taught respecting that mysterious action which in His Divine nature He exercises upon the inward life of the Church, and on the soul of the believer, but still ever in the Church, and through the Church.

---

* Matt. xxviii. 19; John iii.

But this has led us beyond the region of parables, and though we would gladly dilate on it, we must pause. It was our desire to add some remarks upon our Saviour's miracles, as illustrative of His teaching, and of Catholic doctrine; but we have already exceeded reasonable limits. We may therefore reserve our thoughts for another occasion, when we hope not to tax our reader's patience so severely. For we must own, that we can only compare ourselves to a poor beast of burden, which, driven day by day on a long dusty road, cannot resist the temptation of turning into a green field, that lies open on the side; and there rioting somewhat on the dainty food around it, and striving to recall the thoughts and feelings of other days, and live them over again. We have heard that some find a joy in seeing wealth in heaps around them; we have seen the satisfaction of the man of taste when luxuriating amid objects of art; we have felt the delight of living among the records of wisdom of past ages or distant lands; but far, far brighter and happier are hours spent in this treasure-house of knowledge, this rich collection of peerless gems, this library of heaven-fetched, eternal wisdom—the speakings of God to man. If we have ventured in, and may seem to have presumptuously ransacked it, it has only been because encouraged to look in this storehouse of the wise Householder for old things and new; the first to be discovered by earnest study, the latter only by humble and sincere meditation.

THE

MIRACLES

OF

THE NEW TESTAMENT,

AS ILLUSTRATING CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

[From the *Dublin Review* for December, 1849.]

We proceed, in fulfilment of a promise which closed our last essay,* to unfold our thoughts on a subject which cannot fail to interest every reader of the Gospel,—the Miracles of our Lord.

But before entering upon it, we beg for a few moments' grace, while we indulge in some preliminary remarks. In opening our paper on the "Parables," we briefly approved of the critical study of Scripture, and expressed regret that it was not more cultivated among us. In a notice of that paper, in a Catholic periodical, its writer remarked: "We do not agree in all the propositions laid down as to the value and advantages of biblical criticism ourselves." So slight a comment, so passing an observation, so modest an expression of difference of opinion, could never have elicited a word from us, unaccustomed as we are to notice reviews upon our reviews, did it not appear to us to indicate, what we have seen more strongly expressed elsewhere without reference to us—a tendency to depreciate biblical studies, and the theological use of holy Scripture. That persons who have witnessed, during a great part of their lives, the sad and fatal abuse of God's word—who have seen it become a snare to the feet, a veil to the eyes, a cloak to hypocrisy, a seed-bed to heresies, and a very excuse for sin:—that men who have seen havoc come to souls from its misapplication, and ruin to conscience from its distortion,—who have heard every key of the sacred instrument jangling and jarring in distracting dissonance, as at once bravely thumped by the evangelical, and timidly stolen over by the churchman: that they, in fine, who have themselves perhaps lived for a time entangled in the meshes of contradictory interpretation, and have now exclaimed, "Laqueus contritus est, et nos liberati sumus," should look with distrust, and some dislike, on studies which tie men apparently to the killing letter, and quench the living Spirit, is perhaps natural, and as such, pardonable. But there is danger in too violent a rebound; and we are truly and deeply anxious that any extreme views, on so important a subject, should not be encouraged.

---

* Page 192.

Let us for a moment consider this very critical study of God's word. No pursuit has been more abused: and we hope it is looking rather at the abuse than the use, that the writer alluded to tells us, that he does not agree with us, as to the value of that branch of learning. Eusebius, Origen, St. Jerome, St. Augustin, Alcuin, and many others, applied sedulously to it, and their labors have been highly prized by the Church of God. The Council of Trent, in ordering a new revision, and consequently a new *recension*, of the Vulgate to be made, commanded the severe critical pursuits necessary for this purpose.

But we are looking at the matter too seriously. There are two ways in which critics can justify their disapprobation, in sweeping and general terms, of a pursuit. The one is by looking outwardly at its effects and without taking the pains of fathoming it, making up their minds to its inutility. Even a very mild person might be led to pronounce that *conchology*, for instance, however pretty, is not a very useful science, because its influence on society, or letters, or individual character, and its results to mankind, nowhere appear. It is negatively condemned, if one may say so. But a great science, pursued by many great and good men, and, by them, brought to bear upon theology, and upon the preservation of God's word, cannot be so judged; and only they, we will confidently assert, have a right to pronounce who can say that they have gone fully and thoroughly into it, and have discovered its hollowness. Now, unhesitatingly, we declare such a result to be impossible. No one can apply himself to the critical study of the Bible without finding it graceful, noble, sure to enhance his appreciation of the real beauties of the divine writings, certain to bring home to him many hidden treasures, and, at the same time, solid, convincing, based upon sure principles, and superadding the elegant and protecting structure of human research and skill, to the immovable and unshaking foundation on the rock of truth. It is like a bastion thrown out beyond an impregnable fortification; a breakwater outside the safe harbor, scooped in a craggy shore. Neither is necessary for security: but the one terrifies the assailant, and keeps him further from the walls; the other represses the unruly waves, that would fain agitate the haven's calmer waters. No part of biblical science has more thoroughly disappointed the unbeliever, and answered the Catholic's hopes, than the critical study of Scripture.

But probably it will sound strange to some, to hear us pronounce this to be a "graceful or noble" pursuit. Solid it may be; but what there is to captivate the mind, or win admiration, does not easily appear. We speak, then, of this study as catholicly followed; and as the great purpose of our whole paper is to prove how truly Catholics alone hold the sway of scriptural literature, we may be pardoned if we dwell a little longer on this point, and show how we have found this driest and least spiritual looking portion of biblical science, most savory, sweet, and delightful. That the path to it is rugged, intricate, and often consequently wearisome, we will not gainsay; for the principle holds here, as elsewhere, that there is no royal road to knowledge. It requires patience to learn the technical part of the study, to become familiar with its peculiar phraseology, to unravel the intricacies of various systems, classifications, and recensions. Nor can this be attained without the further patience of learning perhaps more than one language, uncouth to the eye, rugged to the ear, and strange to the mind. Then there is a certain amount of practical skill in manipulation to be acquired, which is tedious at first, and requires perseverance. But when these preliminaries have been gone through, the science, even in itself, is interesting and delightful. When an uninitiated person gets an old biblical manuscript into his hands, "miratur pulchros apices," he turns it from end to end, admiring the regularity of the writing, or the preservation of the ink, and gives it back to the librarian, wondering somewhat of what real value such an old volume can be, or whether it may not possibly contain some new and strange reading (if he have heard of such things), which may puzzle critics or commentators. And then he remains "oculis laudator, sed mente non cognitor." Now let the practical critic take it into *his* hand, and see with what confidence and intelligence he handles it. As surely as a *connoisseur* in art examining a picture, he knows how to explore it. The very crackle of the parchment speaks to him: if thin or thick, if polished or rough, if white or yellow, it gives him a mark, a datum for calculation. The color of the ink, the retouching of faded letters, the corrections between lines, all tell *him* a tale. Then he inspects the letters, which, like troops in a review, wear the uniform of a country or age. He pries into their junctures and divisions, their punctuation and length of ranks or lines; he scans their straightness or their flexures, their lengths and breadths. He notes the letters on the margin at given intervals, which to the other appeared random marks, and from all these signs he pronounces, at once, a confident judgment of the volume's age. Now for its country. He looks into the text, darts over a few lines, detects certain errors by substitutions of letters pronounced alike in some countries but not in others, and thus gets a first simple clue. Then with a few master glances, just like an expert leader at the bar, who, turning over folios of foolscap in his brief, catches with his eye just the recital which contains the pith of the bulky brief, and makes up his case, over which his junior has pored for hours; he turns familiarly to a few decisive texts, gives but one scrutinizing look, and, shutting the volume, tells you, not merely its country, but perhaps the very city or monastery in which it was written. As certainly as that picture-critic will distinguish the Spanish from the Flemish school, and even tell you whether your painting came from Andalusia or Estramadura, so surely will the other tell you whether your manuscript was written in Egypt, or on Mount Athos. And of what use is this? Why, he knows, that if you were to read it carefully through, you could not find in it a single novelty; that by no possible combination of chances could it contain a single word that could give the skeptic a new objection, any more than the discovery of any imaginable genuine sketch by Raphael could possibly lead us to the conclusion that he was a bad draughtsman. But at present we are rather bent on proving that this critical study of the Bible is really a pleasant and gratifying pursuit. Let us take another example. Let us suppose that we wish to amuse ourselves with the origin of some outlandish translation. We will take, for instance, the Arabic version of the Psalms, published by Gabriel Sionita, at Rome, in 1614 and 1619,* and most beautifully printed. Be not startled, gentle reader; we are not going to give you a single hard word, or strange-looking character, as we did in our last article. We are not going to use any long technical terms. Follow us gently, and as it were tiptoe; and we will give you a little specimen of critical *clairvoyance*. Look into that cell. It is in an Eastern monastery, on the craggy side of Mount Libanus, with palm-trees shooting up slender around it, and waving their graceful heads to the evening breeze. All is still and calm; the chanting has ceased, and each pious recluse has slowly returned to his cell. Look again at the one we have chosen, rude and bare as it is. There, by the latticed window, thrown open to the setting sun, on his little square mat, sits, Arab fashion, a bearded monk, grave and furrowed with lines of thought. At his left side is his inkstand with his reed-holder, passed behind the girdle like a dirk. In his left hand he holds his page of vellum on a slight board, in his right his ready cane pen: for he leans not his body nor his book on anything when he writes. He lives at a time when the sacred language of his country, the Syriac, is becoming less known even in religious houses, and an Arabic, or vernacular, version is required of the Psalms. He being well skilled in languages, and a worthy man, has been ordered to make it, and is already plying his sacred task.

---

* That is, the same text is reproduced at the latter date with a new title.

Now first, what is he translating from? On a low three-legged stool beside him lies the open volume. What language is it? "How," you reply, "can I possibly see, at this distance of place and time?" Then I will tell you: it is a copy of the Septuagint, or ancient Greek version of the Bible. How do we know this? Every verse of his translation tells us so. For, while that version differs very remarkably from the Hebrew in its readings, his translation throughout keeps close to the former. Well, this is a very simple discovery. But we see that our good monk is not *very strong* in his Greek, for he keeps every now and then looking at another old volume, or rather roll beside him. It is clearly the Hebrew original, which being more akin to his own language, he can better master. He uses it, therefore, as another would a lexicon. Hence through his translation, when a hard and puzzling word comes in the Greek, we find him putting the very Hebrew word into his text, making quite a jumble of it. This tells us that he did not help himself out of another version already made from the Hebrew, but dealt freely with the original. But we have very curious proofs of this. We are now watching him translate Ps. lxxvii. v. 74 (69 Heb. and Gr.). He has hit upon two curious deviations from both the Greek and the Hebrew. And yet we can very easily account for them; but only one way. If in two small words together we imagine him to have mistaken, in one a *beth* for a *caph*, in the other a *caph* for a *beth* (the two *Hebrew* letters being very much alike), we get just his reading. And the same verse contains another certain proof, but too complex for our present purpose.*

See him now fairly nonplussed. He has got to Ps. xxxix. (Heb.) v. 9 (in LXX v. 6). and there he finds the two texts irreconcilably different. You may behold him, with his hands dropped before him on his knees, waving his body backwards and forwards, and gently stroking his beard, as Orientals do when they wish to convey electricity to their brains. And now a bright thought has struck him. He knows not which reading to prefer, so he will put them both in; and consequently he combines them, and gives us in his translation a double version from the Greek and from the Hebrew.* Having discovered this notable expedient, he has recourse to it again in similar difficulties: for example in Ps. xlv. (Heb.) verses 13, 14, where he once more treats us to both texts. But this Psalm seems to have greatly perplexed him; for sometimes, as in a fit of desperation, he fairly takes his departure altogether from both his originals, and hazards a most unacountable paraphrase of his own.† He however finds another remedy in his difficulties. There he gets up, and takes down from his small library, or rather out of his book-chest, another volume. How shall we make that out? Very easily: we can see it from here, as we peep over his shoulder. It is the Syriac *Peshito* version. He is engaged on Ps. xcvii (Heb.), and at every verse he looks into this translation, and does not hesitate to be guided by it. Coincidences so curious occur, as to leave us no doubt of this.‡

---

* See note (A) at the end of this paper.

The good old translator may have pretended what he liked to his less learned brethren, and may have made them suppose that he was very fluent in Greek, and read it off like an Athenian: but he cannot trick us, and we can make out, as plain as if we saw him, every book that he used. Nay, we can even decide to what country his copy of the Greek text belonged, that it had the text, as corrected by Lucian: and probably that it was what is called a Hexaplar copy.

---

* See note (B). † See note (C). ‡ See note (D).

We may be further asked, why we put the author of this version on Mount Libanus, and not in Chaldea, or Egypt, for instance. Here again interior data combine to determine us: the translation from the Greek, and the knowledge of Hebrew do not allow us so easily to attribute it to the first country, where the Greek language had long ceased to be known, and Hebrew could be but little cultivated, before this version was made: while the use of the Syriac version, unknown or unused in Egypt, does not permit us to assign it to the latter. But in Syria we have every requisite condition for explaining the character of this translation.*

But all this may show how any one who has spent perhaps years in the preliminaries of this study, and has some peculiar local opportunities of perusing it practically, may find interest and even amusement in his researches; but what influence can these have upon his higher perception or relish of God's word? Or we may even ask, do they not naturally divert his thoughts from the better study of its uses, and value of its perfection? We say, most decidedly not. An illustration strikes us which may explain our view of the matter better than a disquisition. Let us suppose two enthusiasts about architectural beauty to enter a noble old cathedral; and both, as is the custom with such, straightways to fall into raptures—real ones, in our supposed case, about it. They vie with one another in their exclamations of delight; they praise the harmonious whole,—the exquisite proportions, the gigantic dimensions, the delicate enrichments, the airiness of its superstructures, and the solidity of its walls. Chancel and nave, aisles and transepts, pavement and vault, are accurately scanned, rated, dated, and pricelessly valued. The bewildered verger stands amazed, for they evidently know more than he does, who has been in and out of that church, as man and boy, any day these six-and-thirty years. But of the two admirers, the one has evidently some peculiar skill beyond the other. While one is still rambling on, and re-admiring the same beauties again and again, the other is standing still on one spot, and, book and pencil in hand, is—sketching perhaps? No, actually calculating. In the midst of that wondrous structure, he has the heart to think of Cocker, or Bonnycastle, and to perpetrate so vile a thing as a sum! By a penetrating, as well as a comprehensive glance, he has measured the vast masses which compose the edifice; he has calculated the weight of those enormous blocks which, to his companion's eye and his own, looked so light, more like stalactites pendant from a cavern's roof than solid stone, and appeared hardly to press upon the slim and towering piers. He has estimated how nicely adjusted to the weight is the skilfully-planned support, and what clever combinations were required to produce the actual effect. Moreover, he has accurately ascertained what complicated, yet correct machinery must have been necessary, before the resources of modern mechanics were developed, to exercise the huge power requisite to raise those blocks, and place them securely on their beds high up in air. But if his friend casts on him a glance of almost scorn, as he passes by him, still engaged in his unpoetical labors, how will he regard him when he sees him actually begin to grope and poke into every cranny of the building, and rub off the whitewash, and scrape the pavement and scrub the tombs? And thus he discovers of what curious materials the structure is composed. This pillar is marble, from Devonshire or from Westmoreland; this canopy is stone, from Caen; this monument is alabaster, from Tutbury; this slab is granite, from Anglesey; this bit of pavement is tessellated work from Italy; for here are serpentine and porphyry with gold *smalti*: even the main walls are built up with sandstone from quarries at least twenty miles off, without water-carriage.

---

* What is lightly and vaguely described in the context is the true history of this version. The writers of "Introductions to Scripture" have been satisfied with pronouncing it to be translated from the Septuagint. But a searching collation of a sufficient portion has convinced us that the medley of versions enumerated above has concurred to produce a most anomalous, heterogeneous, and often unacountable, translation. We have minute data for this conclusion. [This might suffice for an anonymous publication; but the author has felt it his duty to give some of these data, in notes at the end of this essay, to prove his statements; though his arguments can have but slight interest, except for biblical critics.]

Now we ask, does this man who thus studies and comprehends the laws of the construction and preservation of the building, and its very hidden and internal substance, lose or gain in true, deep, and earnest admiration of it, and of its wonderful architect? Yet we do not hesitate to say, that in equal measure will he have advantage who has carefully and catholicly pursued the critical study of Scripture. For what else is this but the endeavor to discover the means whereby God has framed and preserved this beautiful structure of His wisdom on earth? It is, in fact, the history of his providential dealings with His own divine Word. As we follow it, we discover the marvellous agencies which have been kept at work to preserve, through the vicissitudes of ages, the sacred text. It is translated in every variety of language, by every diversity of genius and learning; it is collated and revised from the most opposite motives, hostile or friendly, orthodox or heretical. It is transcribed in every country, by holy scribes like Bede and Alcuin, or by hasty, blundering, and mercenary penmen. And this goes on for ages; the Jew desirous of one reading, and the Arian of another, and the Catholic striving for the truth. Only an accurate critical study can give a right notion of these various powers, some naturally appearing to tend towards involving the whole text in inextricable confusion, others to distorting it positively into a wrong direction. Yet as surely as did the steam-engine and the hydraulic press, and the pontoons, and the many capstans with their many crews, lately bring the Britannia tube-bridges into their right position, and firmly plant them there,—because, though to a mere bystander they appeared pulling in various and conflicting ways, yet they were all under the direction of one master-mind,—even so do the many strange powers to all appearance discordantly at work for ages upon the texts of Old and New Testaments appear to the devout scholar, overruled and made subservient, by a wise and unseen control, to the placing and preserving in its high and noble position in the Church, that holy and venerated record of God's mercies. The very jarrings of conflicting interests, the jealousies, the strivings of error against error as against truth, will be found to conspire to the same great purpose. And most certainly, a searching study by a Catholic mind into the very words and points of that sacred writing, is a homage of respect and love to the wise Builder who has employed them as His materials in this His edifice. They who of old loved God's sanctuary, loved the very stones of which it had been built, even after they had been dispersed.* And that study which directs its attention to the materials that enter into the construction of the sacred volume makes us search for their origin, their accurate form. their rightful position; which enables us to see the treasures and curious fragments of different ages and countries, brought from afar, and made to fit in, and strengthen the work; nay, which in the rudeness or elegance of its construction shows us equal aptness, design, and evidence of truthfulness and genuineness,—that study, surely, instead of impairing, greatly must increase our veneration and love for Him who has condescended to speak to man in the language of man, and subject His written, as He did His living, word to the gaze, the scrutiny, and even the inflictions of men. We would venture to say more, were it likely that we should be believed by any but the experienced. We will, therefore, draw this rambling and perhaps tiresome disquisition to a close by referring, as an example, to only one passage, Matt. xxvii. 17, where the terrible awfulness of the proposal which it records, is inexpressibly aggravated, to one acquainted with the critical history of its text.*

---

* Ps. ci. 15.

Most writers who have treated of our Saviour's Parables, have joined to them His Miracles. A considerable number of essays profess to speak of both; and the reason is sufficiently obvious. Our Lord's miracles may be contemplated in three distinct lights.

---

* [As I find this allusion is not easily understood, I take the opportunity of explaining it. From ancient MSS. and other sources, it would appear that Barabbas bore the same name as He, with whom he is here impiously compared; a name at that period not uncommon, but now only to be pronounced with deep reverence, and tender love. Out of these feelings, the robber's prænomen has been dropped from the text: which, with it inserted, would now make one shudder. Pilate's description of our Lord, "who is called, etc.," thus becomes more natural.]

1. Simply as miracles or wonderful works, directed to give overwhelming authority to His teaching, and to evidence His heavenly mission and His divine nature. Hence He Himself repeatedly appeals to them, as proofs of His claim to be heard and believed.* This view of His miracles appertains to the evidences of Christianity; and in that branch of theology, the character, reality, and the testimony of these marvels are duly considered and vindicated.

2. As works of mercy. He whom compassion for fallen man had drawn down from heaven, and who had come to rescue him from sin and death, could not but desire to alleviate those sufferings, which were the consequence of the one, and the precursors of the other. He possessed the power likewise to do so, while he chose to live in privation of the means of ordinary alms-giving. It was by the exercise of His power, therefore, that He gave us example of the discharge of charitable duties towards the poor. He could not give them money, in their illness, to buy food; but he gave them health and strength to earn it. In this way St. Peter considered the exercise of the miraculous

---

* Matt. xi. 20, 24; xii. 41; Mark iv. 40; Luke iv. 36; vii. 16; John ii. 23; v. 36; vii. 31; x. 25. 38; xii. 37; xiv. 12; xv. 24.

powers deputed to him: "Silver and gold, I have none; but what I have I give thee: in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, arise and walk."* Where others gave silver he gave a cure; where others bestowed gold, he bestowed a miracle. The Jews saw our Lord's miracles under this aspect; they not only admired them as evidences of immense power, but they esteemed them as proofs of unbounded goodness. They would have feared Him, whereas they loved Him, had His miracles been only deeds of might; had the withered fig-tree, or the drowned herds of the Gerasenes, alone evinced his greatness,† they never would have exclaimed, "He hath done all things well; for He hath made the deaf to hear and the dumb to speak."‡

3. It is evident that Christ's miracles, even under these two points of view, were powerful auxiliaries to His teaching. The first secured, in earnest-minded hearers of His word, deep attention; the second won from the affectionate, a willingness to be taught. The one drove to conviction, the other led to easy persuasion. According to the principles of the Rhetorician, they respectively served "reddere auditores *attentos* et *benevolos*." The third mode of considering these great works, the one of which we are about to speak, rendered them *docile*, or teachable; for we have to treat of them as important and truthful lessons.

We take it for granted that every Catholic, at least, has been instructed in this mode of reading the Scripture account of our Saviour's miracles. He has again and again read or heard them commented upon, as lessons acted rather than spoken. "Dominus ac Redemptor noster, per Evangelium suum aliquando verbis, aliquando rebus loquitur."* It is nothing new to say that the cleansed leper represents the forgiven sinner, and that the boat saved from the storm, by the power of Jesus present in it, signified the Church. And if the leper is sent to the priest, the Catholic sees naturally the intimation of the priestly ministry in the parallel case. We, therefore, may assume that our Lord's miracles taught a lesson, and some important one.

---

* Acts iii. 6.

† Matt. xxi. 19; Luke viii. 32.

‡ Mark vii. 37.

In treating of the Parables we showed, not, we trust, unsuccessfully, that they contained a distinct body of teaching, corresponding to the prophecy of the Old Testament, and containing the principles, the history, the developments, and the action of the Church. Can we find in the Miracles of our Saviour a counterpart to this? Such is our present inquiry. If what was mysterious in His oral teaching related to things of future accomplishment, it may be fairly surmised that what was still more mysteriously taught by action, should be referable to similar objects. The analogy between a parable spoken and one acted is evident, and a miracle which contains in it a lesson beyond its immediate and obvious purpose, is to all intents and purposes a parable, more even than the symbolical actions of Ezekiel or Osee. For example, when Christ orders His disciples to cast their nets, and though all night they had done so in vain, they now find them filled with the miraculous draught of fishes,* we at once see how appropriately this foreshows, how they, when become "fishers of men,"† shall bring multitudes into that net, which in another spoken parable has been made the image of the Church,‡ without the multitude breaking the net, § that is, destroying religious unity: and how this will be, not by human power, but in obedience to the divine command, and through the energy of grace. For, till the order was given them to go and preach, they had striven in their ministry in vain. Now all this is most apt, not merely because part corresponds to part, but because it corresponds adequately—miracle answers to miracle, each real, and not on the one side figurative. The command of God is equally true in both: and the draught of fishes is miraculous, as is the draught of men in the apostolic net. On the other hand, the cutting and burning of Ezekiel's hair,‖ or his going forth from his house through a hole in the wall,¶ or his lying upon his right or left side,*² or Osee's marriages,†³ bear no proportion to the terrible exercise of power which they figure. They are mere human actions ennobled into representations of divine judgments; whereas, as we have observed, in the Gospel image there was as much miracle on one side as on the other. Yet it must be borne in mind, at the same time, that the one miracle was immediate, definite, and clear to sight, while the other was gradual, indistinct, and to be learnt by reasoning. For, no one doubts that the propagation of Christianity by the twelve fishermen of Galilee was a divine and supernatural work. But while it was going on this could not appear, as it does to us, looking back on its success; nor does the Church's net cease yet to descend, and to bring its goodly freight into the bark of Peter.

---

* St Greg. Hom. 82 in Evang

---

* John xxi. 6.
† Matt. iv. 19.
‡ Matt. xiii. 47.
§ John xxi. 11.
‖ Ezek. v.
¶ xii. 5.
*² iv.
†³ Osee i. iii.

From the illustration which we have given, we may draw some first principles, that will gradually bear us forward towards our object. 1. For, if the analogy between the Parables and the Miracles of the Gospel, corresponding to that between prophecy by words, and prophecy by acts, in the old Law, will suggest their both having a common end and term, the instance which we have chosen will give us a further suggestion. And it is, that the miraculous lesson delivered by Christ our Lord, in action, will have a corresponding reality in what it teaches. If, in the prophets, the act of man was made to represent the action of God, the order cannot be reversed, and the best be degraded, by the actions of God in the flesh, describing or symbolizing anything less than themselves. Miracle can only foreshow, typify or guarantee miracle. Nay, we will venture to say more. The marvel performed as a type cannot be greater than its fulfilment: the latter must be the greater. The delivery of Israel from Egypt was a divine miraculous achievement: the wonders of Aaron's rod, the opening sea, the swallowing of Pharaoh's host by the abyss, the plunder of Egypt, the great work preceded by the mysterious pasch, and apparently dependent on it, were well worthy to be considered final and complete. Yet they were all types: and when the fulfilment came, it came with such a superiority of grandeur and sublime results, as proved how only God can surpass His own work: and *will* surpass it, however magnificent, when it has been the figure of another dispensation.

2. Further, in this second instance we have presented to us another result, which may be also drawn from the first. In both we find, that while the fulfilment is far superior to the figure, yet the appearance of miracle is much greater in the latter. Or we may better express it thus: the fulfilment relates to the order of grace, and the figure belongs to that of nature. The deliverance of man from the broken power of Satan on Calvary was no less real, and was a more wonderful work than the freeing of Israel from Egypt's bondage: yet it was not seen by man's eye, nor felt by his soul, as this was. The conversion of the heathen world was a greater miracle than the catching of one hundred and fifty-three fishes: but conversion was

an inward, soul hidden act. If the miracles of our Lord teach as types, we must expect them to represent other acts in the Church, not only equally, but superiorly to themselves wonderful and miraculous: and yet these may, and probably will, be invisible and belonging to the spiritual life.

We may carry this comparison much further into details. The eating of manna represented the spiritual food in the B. Eucharist:* the drinking from the rock, the refreshment received from Christ:† the raising of the brazen serpent to cure the bite of fiery serpents, the lifting of the cross with its precious burden to heal the angry bite of the infernal serpent:‡ Jonas, in the whale and cast again on shore, our Lord's resurrection.§ The thing represented was far nobler and sublimer than the type in every instance, and intrinsically more prodigious and miraculous; yet this quality did not appear to men's eyes in the reality as it did in the inferior figure. We must ever, therefore, bear this in mind.

The Christian revelation wonderfully opened to man a second world, the sight of which had been utterly withheld from the heathen, and only manifested in glimpses to the bitter Jews. The new heavens and earth thus manifested showed man in a new state; a spiritual life which has its laws, its course, its goods and evils, its beginning and progress, nay, its very food, its organic operations, its illnesses, its cures, its very death, though not destruction. The soul, that indefinite being even in Jewish theology, is with the Christian so real an existence that he can individualize it in mind and separate it in thought from his very self. He can speak of his soul as weak though his body is strong, or as powerful when *he* is feeble; it may be at rest and in peace while his outward existence is passed in tempestuous troubles—the soul may sleep, with Jesus, in the very bark that is tossed on the billows. He may feed that soul while his body is starving; clothe it while his flesh is naked. It may fly towards heaven while the mortal frame creeps on earth, and will attain its object when this perishes. All this requires a system provided for it; the "things spiritual," which are so familiar in the Catholic's mouth. Grace is the sphere, the order in which this spiritual life has place; it is its principle, its breath; the soul of soul, the food, the vesture, the sustaining vigor, the means of growth, the motive power; it is the ruling, and regulating, and perfecting energy of this invisible economy. A Catholic holds and understands all this as though he saw it. But in the Gospel estimate this spiritual order is infinitely higher and nobler than that which includes the body, and its natural contingencies. To cure the soul is infinitely a greater deed and a greater miracle than to cure the body, and so is to raise a soul, far more than to raise a body, from death.

---

* John vi.

† 1 Cor. x. 4.

‡ John iii. 14

§ Matt. xii. 40.

There is thus established a corresponding order of existence and operations between the seen and the unseen life; each being equally real. The Miracles then of our Saviour, if they are representatives of other actions, can find in this spiritual state their truest counterparts,—realities no less marvellous, and of a far superior character.

Yet so long as man has not been totally absorbed into the spiritual life, but still lives on earth, a compound being, it is clear that the ministrations to the spiritual life must pass through his lower state, and be connected with earth. The rain first rises from the earth, then falls on it again, and thence it comes forth once more in bubbling spring, or sparkling fountain, or it steals quietly out a brook or river, with fertilizing energy. And so grace was first begotten on earth, by the merits and the death of the Holy One; thence it was borne to its boundless treasure-house in heaven, whence descending into the Church's rich soil, it is redistributed, in endless beautiful forms, through her various agencies and ministerial institutions. Now the *sacramental* action of Grace, as conceived and understood by the Catholic alone, will exactly answer all the conditions requisite to solve our problem. The sacrament belongs to the higher sphere of the spiritual life; it is supernatural in its invisible efficacy, as the miracle is in its visible effect; yet it is real: it is so perfect a counterpart as to be a sufficient fulfilment; and it is so immeasurably above it, as to be a worthy fulfilment. And such we believe to be the real teaching of the great body of our Saviour's Miracles, as preserved for us in the apostolic records. As the Parables contained the dogmatical and moral principles to be developed in the Church, so do the Miracles show forth the superhuman, and in truth miraculous, agencies of her practical ministry. The one tells us what the Church shall be and say, the other what she shall do.

It is now time that we look into the Gospel itself for the groundwork of this view.

Our blessed Lord, when alone with His disciples, before His passion, said to them: "Amen, amen: I say to you, he that believeth in Me, the works that I do, he also shall do, *and greater than these shall he do.*"* That the miraculous powers alluded to in the first part of the sentence were not bestowed on the body of the faithful indiscriminately, is clear. St. Paul gives evidence that they were at most distributively given to the first Christians:† nor is there reason to suppose that every simple faithful was a Thaumaturgus: it is peculiarly related of St. Stephen, that he being "full of grace and fortitude, did great signs and wonders among the multitude;"‡ as though this gift was special. But to the Apostles and disciples, the gift of doing all miracles, even the same as Christ our Lord, was part of their commission bestowed on all, previous to their receiving any spiritual or priestly charge. "Going, preach, saying: The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils."* Again, to the seventy-two the same power was granted: "Heal the sick . . . and say to them: The kingdom of God hath come nigh unto you."† To the first of these commissions, it seems impossible to add. The four classes of miraculous benefits enumerated, include all that our Saviour ever performed, even to the raising of the dead. And beyond this exercise of miraculous power, how was it possible to go? What greater works than Jesus did, as miracles, remained to be performed, in virtue of his promise? Was it possible to go beyond the raising of Lazarus? The words cannot be so understood. Then we can only reasonably explain them in this sense, that works of equal power, but belonging to a higher order would be performed by the faithful followers, whom the apostles represent. We shall be more ready to admit this interpretation when we see similar language employed elsewhere. For instance:—"Every one who hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred-fold, and shall possess life everlasting."‡ It is clear that the hundred-fold of earthly goods signifies not the reward of the future life, from which it is expressly distinguished, but a recompense in this world. But it means corresponding spiritual gifts, greater because belonging to a higher order, affecting the soul and not the body. For no one has ever imagined that the promise related to the real increase of the very things renounced, except perhaps some sensual millenarians. Yet no doubt the greater things promised are not so striking to sense, so appreciable by the animal man, in his debased nature and with his limited faculties, as are the grosser and more material, though lesser, ones. In like manner, therefore, we may reasonably conclude the greater things than Christ's visible miracles, which the faithful had to perform, to refer to those works of power, which the ministry of the Church effects in the spiritual class of her operations: and this gives us at once her sacramental energy.*

---

* John xiv. 12. † 1 Cor. xii. 11. Acts vi. 8.

---

* Matt. x. 8; Luke ix. 1.

† Luke x. 9.

‡ Matt. xix. 29.

Upon this theory the Catholic easily explains the selection made out of the countless miracles wrought by our Saviour. When St. John, shutting up the Gospel records, twice takes care to inform us, that "many other signs also did Jesus in the sight of His disciples, which are not written in this book,"† and that "the world itself would not be able to contain the books that should be written," to relate all the things which He did;* we must conclude that the miracles recorded are selected from that vast unrecorded multitude because these were particularly important for us to know. Hence St. John tells us what was one main principle in his selection, and it accords exactly with what we concluded respecting his Gospel, when treating of the parables. After the first of these two texts, he continues: "But these [signs] are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.†" In other words, St. John selected his miracles with a view to establish our Saviour's Divinity, against the rising heresies of the early Church. Accordingly, as we find him give fewer parables, so we find him relate fewer miracles. But those which he does record, he describes with a minuteness of detail and a drawing out of proof, which are not only highly interesting, but clearly show his purpose. The most remarkable instance is the cure of the blind man, in his ninth chapter. Every perusal of this beautiful narrative inspires us with fresh admiration. The sifting of the evidence, and the cross-examination of the witnesses, are masterpieces of almost forensic investigation. The resurrection of Lazarus is another similar instance of detailed narration,‡ directed to show how fully the miracle was tested by adverse parties, and how easy would have been its refutation or its gainsaying, had there been a flaw in its decisiveness. Another of St. John's miracles is remarkable, as bearing, like this, upon a point, towards which our Lord seems to have directed more especial miracles than towards any other—the confuting of the Jewish superstitions respecting the Sabbath. St. John relates another cure wrought on the Sabbath for this purpose, on which our Redeemer reasoned against the Pharisees respecting it. This was the cure of the cripple at the pool of Bethesda, in the fifth chapter, referred to and defended in the eleventh.* When we consider that the right claimed by our Lord, over the divine institution of the Sabbath, as the Jews considered it, was as strong proof of His assumption of a Divine power, we can easily understand how St. John, as well a the other Evangelists, should have selected miracles in which this legislative prerogative was exercised. And as we are on this subject, we may close it by remarking, that a similar selection of miracles is to be found in the other Evangelists, not only perhaps to establish the important truth, in the abstract, that the "Son of Man is the Lord of the Sabbath,"† but, as He transferred all His authority to His apostles, and sent them, as His Father had sent Him, to show how they were authorized to exercise this lordship, by the transfer of its obligations to another day. The miracles recorded to prove this truth are, the cure of a withered hand in the very synagogue,* that of a woman bowed down,† and of a dropsical man.‡ It may be worthy of remark that these three miracles (the two last exclusively) are related by St. Luke, whose Gospel we saw, in our former paper, seemed clearly directed to the forming of the Church, already established beyond the want of mere evidence against the Jews (the scope of St. Matthew), in practical virtue and religion. The rules of Christian Sabbath observance, as well as the Church's right to appoint the Christian Sabbath, are thus laid down by him.

---

* [St. Gregory, to omit others, thus writes concerning the miraculous powers given by our Lord to His disciples:—"Habemus de his signis atque virtutibus quæ adhuc subtilius considerare debeamus. Sancta quippe Ecclesia quotidie spiritualiter facit, quod tunc per Apostolos corporaliter faciebat. . . . *Quæ nimirum miracula tanto majora sunt, quanto spiritualia: tanto majora sunt, quanto per hæc non corpora, sed animæ suscitantur.*"—Hom. xxix. in Evang.]

† John xx. 30.

---

* John xxi. 25.

† xx. 31.

‡ xi.

---

* vv. 21–23.

† Matt. xii. 8. Mark ii. 28.

But to return to St. John's Gospel, from which we have somewhat digressed, it may be worthy of notice, that besides the miracles which we have mentioned, the histories of Lazarus, the blind man and the helpless patient of Bethesda, there are only two others recorded by him, before the resurrection, which, while they signally proclaim the divine power of Jesus, are most important for establishing the view which we are taking of His miracles.

While St. John made his selection of signs from the boundless riches of our Saviour's works, the other Evangelists did the same. They all concur in assuring us that He healed every sort of disease;§ and yet it is evident that they ever dwell upon some in particular, and such does our

---

* Mark iii. 2; Luke vi. 6.

† Luke xiii. 11.

‡ Luke xiv. 4.

§ Matt. iv. 23; xv 30; Mark i. 32; Luke vii. 21.

Lord Himself ever select. And these we shall find, both in their own nature and in the circumstances accompanying them, the liveliest image possible of the sacramental institutions in the Church. We will rapidly glance at each :—

I. *Baptism.*—The most striking effect of conversion in the early Church would be the admission to a new and wonderful knowledge of religious truth. The cleansing from original sin would be known as the direct grace of the Sacrament; but the obvious effect, and the fruit of the grace, would be the initiation into the beauties of the Christian mysteries, and the participation thence resulting in the vast range of sublime religious thought. What a flash of intellectual illumination would dart upon the soul of a right-minded heathen, who had been groping in the gloom of complete ignorance or in the twilight of a striving philosophy, when, for the first time, the Christian doctrine of man's origin, destiny, fall, and reparation, was unfolded to him! What a steady, calm, and cheering brightness would seem to overspread the moral firmament, when the principles of love of God and man, and the splendid system of Christian virtues, were completely communicated to him! If to men of study, of thought, and of superior mind, such as Brownson or Stolberg, the passage from a false Christianity to the true has appeared as the transition from light to darkness; if their previous wisdom has seemed to them as mere childish perception compared with the clearness and brilliancy of the spiritual light which has shone on them, and played from its vivid centre on all other objects of knowledge, and kindled them up in its own warm ray;—what must the beam have been that flashed on a Dionysius, from the lips of St. Paul, when his noble doctrines threw into the shade all the wisdom of the Athenian council? Surely to say that "their eyes had been opened,—that they had passed from darkness to light,—that now indeed they saw,"—would be the most natural expressions they could use to describe the intellectual change which they experienced in themselves. What would a moral pagan thinker, who was drawn towards Christianity, most naturally ask, but *Domine ut videam?*—"Lord that I may see?"* Hence, any one conversant with the New Testament will at once remember that "darkness" in it signifies the state of man before Christ's coming; and "light" the condition of those who followed Him.

But the spiritual condition of man was not merely one of darkness and blindness: it resembled rather a state of total helplessness. Even when his feeble ray of moral light showed him the right way, he had no strength to follow it.

"Video meliora proboque,
Deteriora sequor,"

was a true picture of man's mind, in regard to moral good. There was no vigor nor energy in the will; there was no stimulant to the choice of good; and, worse than all, there was no consciousness nor hope of any infusion of a superhuman grace. But when the Christian found himself suddenly, not only able to fulfil the law of nature, but to "run in the way" of most arduous commandments; nay, when he felt himself ready and eager for suffering and death for Christ, and saw his tender daughter joyfully weaving for her own head the lily and the rose, into a double crown of virginity and martyrdom; to what would he liken himself better, than to one who had lain grovelling till then in impotent lameness, a cripple in every limb, till set free; and new strength and buoyancy had been marvellously bestowed upon his spiritual frame?

---

* Luke xviii. 35; Matt. xx. 33; Mark x. 51.

Every other sense, even the most inferior, has its parallel in the spiritual life. The soul hears in Christianity by that docility of learning, and that readiness of obedience, which belong exclusively to the believer. "The Lord hath opened my ear, and I do not resist,"[*] exclaims Isaias in the person of Christ. And frequently those who refuse to hear the word of God, through him, are styled by him deaf,[†] as they are by the other prophets.[‡] In the New Testament a similar use occurs.[§] To open the mouth or the lips, expresses similarly the power worthily to praise God, and to speak His truths.* Again, therefore, we may easily imagine how a Christian, once fully imbued with the truths of his religion, one to whom the wonderful mystery of the blessed Trinity had been taught, with its no less sublime sequel, the Incarnation, able now to address God as He is,† and, to speak worthily of His nature, would feel as though the enjoyment of a new sense had been given him, and his tongue had been loosened, like Zachary's,‡ to proclaim the mercies of God.

---

[*] Is. l. 5.

[†] vi. 10; xliii. 8; xlviii. 8. lxiv. 4.

[‡] Jer. v. 21; vi. 10; xi. 8; xxxiv. 14; Ezek. xii. 12; xl. 4. Mic. vii. 6; Zac. vii. 11.

[§] Mark viii. 18; Acts xxviii. 26; Rom. xii. 8.

There are some other circumstances worthy of consideration in this matter.

1st. The afflictions which we have enumerated are almost always congenital, or date from birth. The blind, the deaf and dumb, and the crippled, are almost always born so; the cases that arise from accident are the exceptions. And in the New Testament this circumstance is particularly recorded. St. John expressly tells us, that the blind man cured by Jesus had been so from birth: § and two cripples, cured by St. Peter and St. Paul, are especially described as such from their mothers' wombs.‖ The state, therefore, was one of privation rather than of loss; it came with birth, and was a natural condition. This class of visitation represents, in consequence, the state of man not brought to Grace, better than those sicknesses or infirmities which have afterwards grown upon him, or have resulted from personal misfortunes. When the disciples asked our Lord, if the blind man had been so afflicted for his parents' sins,* they gave us no bad clue to the discovery of the cause of man's spiritual blindness.

---

* Ps. l. 17; Prov. viii. 6; Is. vi. 8; l. 4; Jer. i. 9; Ezek. iii. 27.

† In confessione veræ fidei, æternæ Trinitatis gloriam agnoscere, et in potentia majestatis adorare unitatem."—Collect for Trinity Sunday.

‡ Luke i. 64. § John ix. 1. ‖ Acts iii. 12; xiv. 7.

2. In those whom our Saviour cured, by restoring to them lost senses or power of limbs, poverty seems generally to have been an additional affliction. That he was equally willing to heal the rich as the poor, we cannot doubt. But the Evangelists have recorded for us comparatively few instances of His going into the houses of the wealthy for such a purpose. It was the multitude that flocked around him in the streets, the beggars on the roadside, and at the gates of towns,† who chiefly applied to him for relief. He went to sup with Simon the leper,‡ but we do not read that He healed him. Perhaps the proud Pharisee, who despised Magdalen, was above asking for it, or recognizing our Lord's miraculous power. This further enhances the parallel between man in his fallen state, and the healed by Christ. He was spiritually poor as well as blind, lame, deaf, and dumb.

---

* John ix. 2.

† Matt. xx. 30; Mark x. 52; Luke xviii. 43.

‡ Mark xiv. 3.

3. These particular ailments are especially connected, as consequences, with demoniacal possession. We have three remarkable cases recorded of this. The first is related by St. Matthew and St. Luke, of a dumb demoniac.* The second is of one possessed, who was deaf and dumb, mentioned by St. Mark and St. Luke.† The third unites with possession, the triple loss of sense; the energumen being blind and deaf, consequently dumb, as described by St. Matthew alone.‡ Now, here again is a most striking similitude between the spiritual condition of man and the physical state of those whom Jesus Christ mostly cured on earth, so far at least as it has been thought, for our instruction, right to record. Man's soul was blind, deaf, and dumb, through the fearful possession of the evil one, who had usurped God's dominion over the mind and heart of man. He was in the bondage of the devil, as well as in darkness and gloom. Hence the two are joined in enumerating the objects of Christ's mission. "To preach deliverance to the captives, and sight to the blind," had been foretold by Isaias, and is quoted by St. Luke,§ as descriptive of His glorious work. And speaking of this satanic mastery over man's body, we may as well remark how fearfully, yet how strikingly, it was meant to represent a similar tyranny over his soul, in one

---

* Matt. ix. 33; Luke xi. 14.

† Mark ix. 16, 24 ("Deaf and dumb spirit") Luke ix. 38.

‡ Matt. xii. 22.

§ Is. lxi. 1; Luke iv. 19.

other gospel description of it. It was a legion of devils that had invaded him, their influence had brutalized him to the level of the most unclean of animals, and then pushed him headlong into a gulf in which he must perish.*

We have not thought it necessary to strengthen what we have written by reference to authorities. There is not a point which we could not corroborate from the holy Fathers, who again and again represent the blind, the deaf and dumb, and the demoniacs as representing man in his fallen state. We will, therefore, proceed at once to the application of what we have said.

The rite by which, in ancient as in modern times, the Church acts upon that state of man, touches him with the healing power of Christ, frees him from Satan's gripe, changes his condition, opens his eyes, his ears, his mouth, and makes him rightly see, hear, and speak, and gives him strength to walk in God's commandments, is holy Baptism. So natural was this idea, that her whole ritual of baptism is based upon it.

First; the exorcisms which occupy its first part, show that the unbaptized are placed by her in the class, spiritually, of those under the grasp and control of the evil one. He is rebuked, cursed, and disdainfully adjured, and violently thrust out; and this is done with an energy and rudeness of language exactly suited to the object, and like to what our Saviour used with His demoniacs. Dr.

---

* Matt. xviii. 24.

Pusey, in his well-remembered Tract on Baptism, has proved that every liturgy but the Anglican contains these exorcisms, and consequently this idea.

Secondly; the senses are treated as requiring restoration, and the very rites are copied which our Lord condescended to employ for the purpose of restoring them. When "they brought to him one deaf and dumb, and besought Him that He would lay His hand upon him," he would not consent to exercise His power, by that ordinary mode; but "taking him from the multitude apart, He put His fingers into his ears, and spitting, He touched his tongue; and looking up to heaven, He groaned and said to him: Ephpheta, which is, be thou opened."* Now this ceremony the Church has, from the beginning, adopted into her ritual for baptism: where the priest, touching the ears of the catechumen, pronounces the same word, touching similarly with spittle, as in imitation of the divine action the nostrils. And then into the mouth is put the salt, "the sacramentum salis," still further symbolizing the opening of the mouth, to speak heavenly wisdom, of which salt is the emblem.

Thirdly; in the rite for the baptism of an adult, there is a striking ceremony, which expresses strongly the Church's thought on this resemblance. The officiating bishop or priest signs with the cross the various senses, with appropriate words.

---

* Mark vii. 33.

"I sign thy forehead ✠ that thou mayest receive the cross of Christ. I sign thine ears ✠ that thou mayest hear the divine precepts. I sign thine eyes ✠ that thou mayest see the brightness of God. I sign thy nostrils ✠ that thou mayest feel the sweet odor of Christ. I sign thy mouth ✠ that thou mayest speak the words of life. I sign thy breast ✠ that thou mayest believe in God. I sign thy shoulders ✠ that thou mayest receive the yoke of His service. I sign thee all ✠ [not touching] in the name of the Father, ✠ and of the Son, ✠ and of the Holy Ghost, ✠ that thou mayest have life everlasting, and mayest live for ever and ever. Amen." Again, when the bishop in the porch of the church, truly to the Catholic "the beautiful gate" of God's house, stretches out his hand to the catechumen there kneeling, and raises him up, and saying to him, "Enter into the Church of God," leads him, holding by his stole, for the first time into the temple, how much the resemblance must strike us with what was done by Peter, the first bishop after Christ, when, in the name of Jesus, he bid the lame man, at the temple gate, to rise; "and taking him by the right hand, lifted him up;" and the man "walked, and went with them into the temple, walking, and leaping, and praising God;" and he on his part, "held Peter and John,"* no doubt, by their garments, as affectionately clinging to them.

---

* Acts iii. 1–11.

Fourthly; but the great blessing of baptism or bringing to the faith, was that which St. Peter so beautifully expresses when addressing his new Christians, in the words adopted from him by St. Augustine, in speaking to the newly baptized, calling them, "a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people; that you may declare," he adds, "His virtues, who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light."* While the miracles that regard other bodily organs and powers may be considered as accessories, this bestowing of the grace of Faith, the foundation of all other virtues, must be considered as the very essence of baptismal regeneration, and is truly the bringing of blind nature to the "marvellous light of God." Hence in the baptismal service of the Church it is frequently alluded to, under this image. In the very opening prayer, with his hand placed on the child's or catechumen's head, the priest thus speaks:—"All blindness of heart drive from him, break the bonds of Satan in which he hath been bound." And again, more solemnly, and with the same important action, he prays as follows:—"I entreat Thy eternal and most just pity, holy Lord, Father almighty, eternal God, author of light and truth, on behalf of this thy servant N., that Thou wilt vouchsafe to enlighten him with Thine intellectual light." And this in the baptism of adults, is preceded by an abjuration of Satan, in these words: "For He commandeth thee, accursed one for ever lost! who opened the eyes of the man born blind." Finally, in the same service we have the following prayer: "I beseech Thee, holy Lord, Father almighty, eternal God, that to this Thy servant N., who wanders uncertain and doubtful in the night of this world, Thou wilt command the way of Thy truth, and of knowledge of Thee to be shown; that the eyes of his heart being opened, he may know Thee, one God, the Father in the Son, and the Son in the Father, with the Holy Ghost,"* etc.

---

* 1 Pet. ii. 9

These passages will prove sufficiently how strong the analogy is in the mind of the Church between the giving of sight to the bodily blind, and of faith to the unbaptized. Among the rites familiar to our Saviour as a means of cure, was that of laying His hands upon the patient, a ceremony which may be said to have become especially sacramental. This was employed by Him in curing the blind; and in one instance remarkably: "And taking the blind man by the hand, He led him out of the town; and spitting upon his eyes, laying His hand upon him, He asked him if he saw anything. And looking up, he said: I see men, as it were trees walking. After that, again He laid his hands upon his eyes, and he began to see and was restored, so that he saw all things clearly."* Now we have seen how just twice, in the administration of baptism, the priest places his hand upon the child, with a prayer for the removal of blindness at the first, and for the granting of light at the second time.

---

* We can only refer to the Roman Ritual or Pontifical, where the two baptismal services are given, for these various extracts.

But another instance is more remarkable. When Saul is overtaken by the merciful judgment of God, on the road to Damascus, he is struck blind. Was this merely to humble and subdue his haughty spirit, to tame him, like a blinded eagle, plucked down in his first flight for prey? Or is there not also in this a deeper symbolic meaning, to show him how the power of the Church's ministry, while it cured his corporal blindness, gave his soul also intellectual light? For Ananias coming in to baptize him, "laying his hands upon him," said: "Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus hath sent me... that thou mayest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight; and rising up he was baptized."† Now here we have the very miracle of blindness cured, connected with the baptismal rite: nay, more, to all appearance, blindness inflicted, on purpose to show the close analogy between the two, and to bring the visible miracle in confirmation of the invisible.

Our Lord Himself, however, has directly given us the most interesting example of this connection. We have before referred to the detailed account preserved by St. John, of the cure of a blind man. In this instance our blessed Saviour first made use of the mysterious ceremony described by St. Mark. For, "He spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and spread the clay upon his eyes." This, one might have supposed, would have sufficed to complete the cure. And so it would have done, had He so willed it. But, undoubtedly to teach a lesson, of which we ought to learn the import, He "said to him: Go wash [bathe] in the pool of Siloe, which is interpreted, Sent. He went therefore, and washed, and he came seeing."* If Jesus desired to symbolize the miraculous action of baptism as we have described it, as giving the divine light of Faith supernaturally to the soul, He could not have done it more completely than in this, the most minutely recounted of all His cures wrought on the blind. The anointing of the eyes, for so the text describes it,† was only made a preliminary ceremony, like the unction with the oil of catechumens in our baptism; but the cure was completed by the waters—not of the Jordan, the waters of John, but of the bathing-pool of Siloe, the waters of the Messiah. And even this choice is most expressive, when we take into account the Jewish belief concerning it, that it was the most efficacious bath for purification from legal defilement.* Not even Cæsar's celebrated report, "Veni, vidi, vici," expressed more emphatically the rapidity of his conquest, than does the blind man's narrative, the instantaneousness of his cure. "That man that is called Jesus made clay, and anointed my eyes, and said to me: Go to the pool of Siloe, and wash. *And I went, I washed, and I see.*" No wonder that the ancient Christians should have applied to the baptistery the very word used in this passage, calling it, among other names, the κολυμβήθρα or swimming-bath; doubtless from this very passage.

---

* Mark viii. 22–26.

† Acts ix. 18.

---

* John ix. 6, 7.

† 'Επέχρισε, v. 6. The act here described, like that before quoted from St. Mark viii. 23, will appear in no ways strange to those who are aware how much a similar practice was in use among the Jews, and other nations of antiquity. See Wetstein *in loc.*

All that we have said will receive confirmation from a beautiful passage in Isaias, and will, in return, throw light upon it. It is the following: —"God Himself will come, and will save you. Then shall the eyes of the blind be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as the hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall be free. *For waters are broken out in the desert, and streams in the wilderness* .... And a path and a way shall be there, and it shall be called the holy way; the unclean shall not pass over it; and this shall be unto you a straight way, so that fools shall not err therein .... they shall walk there that shall be delivered."* It is to spiritual ailments alone that allusion can here be made.

---

* "Even if he should wash himself in the waters of Siloam ..... he would not obtain complete cleanness."—Talm. Hieros. Ibid. Where see also, on v. 6, the Jewish denunciation against anointing the eyes, or rubbing them with saliva on the Sabbath. Compare v. 13.

It may well appear superfluous to add that only in Catholic baptism is a counterpart discoverable, to the class of miracles which we have united together, as they generally are classified in the Gospels. The exorcisms and other prayers which we have quoted, have disappeared from the Protestant Liturgy; all intimation of belief in effects parallel to those miracles of our Lord will be sought there in vain. But not only in the formularies, but in the opinions, of the Anglican system, there is a total absence of the doctrine necessary to establish such a parallelism as we have traced. We are sure that Faith is there neither spoken of, nor considered, as a gift of God, an infused virtue, actually and instantly communicated to the soul in baptism—into the soul even of an infant. Faith with Protestants is a profession of a mode of thought; thought being an act of the individual. Hence, in Confirmation, the Anglican system looks to personal profession of what had been professed by proxy, in baptism. But there is no actual belief (unless it be in the ideal church which lurks in the closets of Oxford theologians) that the child had, from baptism, possessed an inherent, true, and orthodox faith. Hence the first question in the Catholic Ritual, put to the catechumen is, "N., What dost thou ask of the Church of God?" and the answer is,

---

* Is. xxxv. 4–9.

"Faith." That the Anglican theory, even when elevated to the highest stage of High-churchism, has no perception of this most important point of the doctrine of baptism, will appear from this, —that none more than Oxford theorists try to deter ladies and young men from becoming Catholics, by telling them that thereby they will be renouncing "the Church of their baptism." For such a phrase can only signify, that in baptism they were incorporated into the English establishment, as a body distinct from the *orbis terrarum* Church, or the Catholic Church in communion with Rome. For if Anglicanism be part of the one universal Church, such an expression is as unmeaning and as absurd as if one were to say to a man, "Do not become a British subject, lest you cease to be a citizen of London;" or to a soldier, "Do not join the body of the army, lest thereby, you renounce your regiment." The phrase, therefore, means that Anglicanism is so distinct from Catholicity, as that the baptism of the one is not that of the other. Now for this to be, either the baptized child receives no faith, or it receives faith according to the holding of Anglicanism, as distinct from that of the Catholic Church; and that is clearly no faith at all. The only sense to be attached to such a now "cant phrase" is:—"In baptism you made *profession* of Anglicanism, and it is sinful in you to depart from that *profession*." And this meaning is rendered more evident by the fact that they who use it *profess* Anglicanism, but make no scruple of *believing* Catholicity. The expression is another Protestant novelty: we are only surprised that it had not been forestalled by the Donatists. It makes the Church more like the corporation of a close borough, than the empire of God over the whole world.

The Catholic Church, on the other hand, considering baptism as the *Janua Ecclesiæ*,—"the gate of the Church," considers every one validly (even though unlawfully) baptized, as a member of the true Church, a Catholic, possessing sound faith, as well as other infused virtues, and as continuing so until some contradictory act destroys the virtue, and transfers the unhappy victim to the dominion of error, schism, or heresy. Look well to this, ye high-church teachers; every one of you, if duly baptized, has once, in the estimation of the Catholic, Universal, One Church, been a member of it. Each of you has left it by an act of apostasy! and your children, whom you have with your own hands baptized, that the sacred rite might not be made void by the profane carelessness of its daily administration around you, these yet innocent prattling little ones are still ours, in communion with the holy Church of God throughout the world. When the day comes that you, more in doubt than is consistent with safety, about your own position, shall pour into their docile ears the poison of a heresy which you regret, shall make them believe that Jesus Christ has left no one united Church on earth, or that he commanded not communion with Peter, or that the titular of your diocese is a descendant of the apostles, or that Mary should not be invoked, or that baptism made them Anglican, or that there is no real corporeal presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, or that priestly absolution is not of necessity for pardon of sins; or should the day come (for strange things do now happen) when you will teach exactly the contrary, and tell your children that your Church (as you call it) holds every one of the opposite doctrines, just as Catholics do, and so cheat them verily into an heretical profession of orthodox doctrine; when that day comes, know ye, that you will be guilty of a parricidal act; you will pluck from off your children's body that white garment of innocence (for heresy is sin) which in every real baptism is spiritually placed upon the neophyte; you will snatch the burning lamp of orthodox faith from their hands; you will tear off the garland of joyful adoption which true baptism placed upon their heads. You will do worse; you will reverse the wonders of baptism; you will undo its miracle. You will blind the eyes that have been once opened, seal up the ears again that have been unstopped, tie up the tongue that has been loosened, and cripple the limbs that have been made whole. Oh! think of this, before it becomes too late. You, whose minds are tempest-tossed, uncertain of your faith, who perhaps flatter yourselves with the hope that unity may yet be restored, and you may be carried safely by the gulf-stream into the haven of Catholic rest; you, who will not venture to say that no occurrence may happen that will unmoor you from your present position, and drive you into our Church; you, above all, who say, that while you believe it to be your duty to remain where God has placed you, you would rejoice had His Providence from the beginning rooted you in the Catholic Church, who "would give anything" to have been always Catholic. Spare your own pains, your own stings, your own tortures, to those you love; forego the delusion that you can educate your children Catholics in an Anglican church, or an Anglican parsonage; frankly and generously give them up to the only mother that will train them holily; make them pledges of your love, which you give not to your own system; send your treasures where you profess your heart to be, that the two be together, and you give not the lie to truth. Yes, we boldly repeat it, there are many now in Anglicanism, who cannot, without fearful sin, allow their children to be brought up in it, for they have not the excuse of a false conscience. Their only escape is to let them continue safe in the Church of their baptism, the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.

II. *Penance.*—It will not be necessary to delay the reader longer upon the other Sacraments. The application of our Lord's miracles to them will be less complicated. If those afflictions which disable man for work, which afflict him from his birth, which visit him rather as negations or privations of good than as a positive withdrawal of what has been held, and which were in Christ's time united often with demoniacal possession, seem most aptly to apply, as figures, to unregenerated man; those ailments and diseases which befall him in his course of life, and often end in death, may be taken to symbolize those spiritual distempers which he brings upon his soul by sin. Indeed, so accurately could the resemblance be traced, that particular complaints might be easily compared to particular sins or vices. Even the heathen poet could read the parallel between the avaricious mind and him who

"Crescit indulgens sibi dirus hydrops."

Anger is a fever of the mind, anxious care its gnawing canker, jealousy its jaundice, pride its plethory, sloth its atrophy.

But we will confine ourselves to three of the lashes of that scourge which fell upon man when first he sinned.

1. The first of these is palsy. It is not unfrequently the consequence of excess, and it reduces the man to a helpless condition; it deprives him often of utterance, it incapacitates him for work. It makes him, as far as possible, what we have before described, as symbolizing the state of fallen man. What more exact image of what man does to his own soul by sin? He makes it a palsy-stricken, prostrate, trembling, helpless, useless, wretched thing. The cure recorded by

the three first Evangelists,* of a paralytic man, is especially interesting for this, that it is evidently recorded to establish the Catholic doctrine on forgiveness of sins. The patient is brought before our Saviour, by being let down through the roof; and instead of being at once healed, he is addressed in these words: "Man, thy sins are forgiven thee." Now, this mode of acting no doubt proceeded from the charity and goodness of Jesus, who, like a skilful physician, would not deal with a lesser malady while there was a greater in possession. But the words were, most assuredly, designedly spoken. They were intended to provoke a grave objection, and to afford an occasion to answer it: and that answer was to be of solemn and dear importance to us. They indicate, moreover, how the sight of man's corporal affliction brought to our Lord's mind his spiritual and unseen state. For else, wherefore did He not address the same words to any of the bystanders, who may have needed, as no doubt most did, this timely pardon? But this poor wretch's prostrate frame and quivering limbs were to Him but the lively image of a soul overthrown and disabled by sin. Some Protestant commentators have considered this expression equivalent to a declaration of cure; but it is clear that the effect of restoration to bodily health did not ensue. We must, therefore, conclude, that true remission of sins was here granted; and the more, because the very same words are used as were on occasion of Magdalene's forgiveness.* The Jews inwardly think that our Lord blasphemes by arrogating a power which belongs exclusively to God. "Who is this that speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God alone." Had He merely cured the poor man, they would not have raised the objection. They had seen Him cure plenty of such: but, evidently, they considered the power of healing spiritual maladies so much higher and greater, that they could not allow the one necessarily to involve the other. He, therefore, meets their thoughts; and answers: "Which is easier to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee; or to say, Arise and walk? But that you may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins (He saith to the sick of the palsy), I say to thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house."† Our Lord Himself may be said here to draw the resemblance; first, between the two ailments,—the body's and the soul's; and secondly, between the cure of the one and that of the other, between the healing of a grievous malady, and the forgiveness of sin. He, moreover, establishes the adequacy of the resemblance, comparing them as acts of power, and showing how one was of the same nature as the other—each a miracle. If, then, to the apostles He gave this very power—"heal the sick;"‡ and if afterwards, as though almost alluding to this very passage, and using the same words, He repeats the assertion of His own power on earth and communicates it to them, to the extent of exercising, that which He cured the palsied man to claim—the forgiving of sins,* we may surely conclude that this prerogative was received by them in a sense which perfectly made it correspond to the miraculous gifts conferred on them. And who doubts that of the two, the spiritual healing was a much greater boon from Christ our Lord than the visible and corporal? Who doubts that, "thy sins are forgiven thee," though to men as easy to say, was a far greater mercy, than, "arise, take up thy bed!" Had the latter alone been spoken, it might have been the prolongation only of a life of sin, and an accumulation of condemnation, that would have ensued. Had the former only, they would have secured to the sick man, at least, an everlasting life. And as the boon, so was the power from which it flowed.

---

* Matt. ix. 6; Mark ii. 10; Luke v. 24.

---

* Luke vii. 48. † Ib. v. 23, 24. ‡ Matt. x. 8.

Here, then, we have the parallel exactly established between a visible act of supernatural power, and an invisible exercise of an equal, or greater, power. When the Apostles raised a paralytic, all the multitude would applaud, as they no doubt did when St. Peter, almost in the same words as his divine Master, said to Eneas, "who was ill of the palsy," "Arise, and make thy bed; and immediately he arose."* But they did much more, and no one saw it, when, in virtue of their higher commission, they forgave a man his sins. This parallel leads us to the following conclusion: 1st. The commission to forgive sins was, in regard to the soul, what the charge to heal the sick, here fulfilled by St. Peter, was with respect to the body. 2ndly. It was to be exercised by a specific act, as was the raising of the paralytic. 3rdly. It was to be not declaratory, but efficacious. 4thly. It was to be followed by instantaneous effect. The sinner was to be as truly forgiven, on the words being pronounced, as the sick man was well, when he had heard the command to arise. Surely it is only in the Catholic Church that all this has reality; or even that any one believes that there exists, vested in the successors of the Apostles, a power which permits of such a comparison with the cure performed by our blessed Redeemer.

---

* Compare "the Son of Man hath *power on earth* to *forgive sins*," with "*all power* is given to me in heaven *and on earth*" (Matt. xxviii. 18), and, "as the Father sent me [*on earth*], so do I send you. Whose *sins* you shall *forgive*, they are *forgiven* them" (John xx. 21, 23). The words in italic are the same, in the different passages, in the original.

2. It would be wasting our reader's time to endeavor to prove that the leprosy was a fitting emblem of sin. This fitness arises from the character of the disease; it is an uncleanness as well as a malady. It commenced generally by a small

---

* Acts ix. 38. While this miracle presents a resemblance to the healing of the palsied man in the Gospel, the account which immediately follows it (the raising of Tabitha), has no less resemblance to the raising of the daughter of Jairus. (Matt. ix. 23.)

spot: if not checked, it increased and spread; it eat into the live flesh, it separated the limbs at the joints, and it finally caused death. It was, moreover, deemed infectious, and thus further resembled sin. But in addition, it was not left to be treated by the physician; but was placed especially under the jurisdiction of the priests. To them the person, conscious of the disease, had to present, and to denounce, himself. They had the minutest rules to guide them, in forming their judgment and pronouncing on the complaint. If they did not declare the patient clean, they put off his case for some days longer, and he again submitted to sacerdotal judgment. Even if he were now declared free, he had to perform certain acts, as washing his garments, before he rejoined his people. But when the defilement was certain, and the disease manifest, he was separated from the people; he wore a peculiar garb; he lived without the camp or city; and he cried out to every passer-by that he was unclean. Then, if at last restored to health, many mysterious rites had to be performed: the principal or final one of which was, that he should "take a lamb and offer it up as a trespass offering," and "immolate the lamb where the victim for sin is wont to be immolated, and the holocaust; that is, in the holy place." * All this was done after the leper had been allowed to return to the communion of his fellow-citizens.

We cannot be surprised that the ancient

---

* Levit. xiii. xiv.

Church should universally have considered this malady as the most natural type of sin in the individual, as the privations of sense in our former classification were of the sin of the whole race. Leprosy and sin are almost synonymous in ecclesiastical language, even where the bodily affection itself was unknown. But to see fully the accuracy of the resemblance, we should view it as demonstrated in the discipline of the ancient Church. There the sinner, as now, when conscious of transgression, presented himself to the priest of God. But in those days of fervor, this minister of justice, as of mercy, took into deliberate consideration the offence committed; and, while he admitted to forgiveness, and slighter works of purification, the lesser offender, sentenced the more guilty to public separation from the faithful, and severe expiation of his crime. His leprosy was revealed to all by his penitential garb; and how strikingly resembling the treatment of the leper must his case have appeared, as he stood at the gate of the church, telling all that entered in, that he was a sinner, unworthy to join them in communion of sacred offices. Then, when the time came for pardon, the priest once more spoke, and pronounced him clean: And what was his first act? Surely, as it is now, with every penitent in the Catholic Church, to hasten to the holy place, to assist at the immolation of the lamb slain for sin, and there partake of the sacred victim. And although that outward separation from the faithful, which served to make the parallel so perfect, has now ceased in the discipline of the Church, yet all that is essential has remained; so that to this day, "to distinguish between leprosy and leprosy," is a familiar expression in writers instructing the priest how to discern and deal with sin.

It will not be surprising that our Saviour should have dealt with this distemper as distinct from other ailments. The cleansing of lepers is distinguished from other works of power, both in the narrations of the Evangelists, and in His own enumeration of such acts.* In His commission to His apostles, this is mentioned as one of the powers committed to them. But he was pleased to show how He did not allow even the exercise of His miraculous power to supersede the provisions of His law. Accordingly we find that in every instance distinctly recorded of His healing this complaint, He sends the patients to the priest, to receive from him ratification as it were of the cure which He had performed. Whether He first completed it, or left the recovery to appear after, He gave them the same command.† Now if leprosy represented sin, and the miraculous healing of it showed forth the pardon of sin in the Church, this peculiar attention to the law which over Him had no force, most aptly serves to complete the resemblance; by showing how, if even in the figure He would have the interposition of the priestly ministry, so much more does He require it in the fulfilment, which He has made one of the very highest duties and prerogatives of the sacerdotal office.

---

* Matt. x. 8; xi. 5; Luke vii. 22.

† Matt. viii. 4; Mark i. 44; Luke v. 14; xvii. 12.

In describing the treatment of sin in the Church, compared with the treatment of leprosy in the old law, we have shown how exactly the type finds its accomplishment in the former. And we see how the inward cleansing from sin, by the word of the priest, corresponds exactly with the action of Christ, when, in commanding phrase, he simply says: "I will: be made clean." But if it is exclusively a Catholic practice and doctrine thus to make forgiveness of sin dependent on the exercise of an act of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; if it be solely with us that the leper must come before him who has to heal him, and declare himself unclean, as such did with our Lord,—how boldly Catholic is that further analogy with what He practised, which consists in compelling even those whom God Himself has pardoned to show themselves to His priests, make known even forgiven transgression, and hear his sentence, though in this case anticipated, rather than ratified, in heaven. For while no one, even in the Anglican system, dares to make confession compulsory, in even extreme cases, but some admit it as one mode of obtaining pardon, the Catholic Church admits of no exception. Let the sinner, pierced, not by lightning of God's judgment, but by the very arrows of His love; plunged, not into an abyss of despair, but into an ocean of sweetest confidence, burst his very heart in penitent sorrow; let it be full and deep as that of David, when Nathan pronounced his forgiveness:* tender and gushing as that of Magdalene, when Jesus spoke her pardon: let it be that perfect contrition which bespeaks instant remission; yet he hears a voice, as he rises from the outpouring of his grief, which tells him: "Go, show thyself to the priest." He knows it has been a condition of his forgiveness (if he can presume to hope it has been already granted), that he should submit to the keys of the Church, manifest his past frailty, and receive the only assurance of reconciliation and restored grace in this life—the absolution of Christ's minister. In fact, so perfectly does the Church Catholic act up to this example of her Lord, and believe in the lesson which He gave for curing the leprosy, that she admits no contrition to be perfect which does not contain confession *in voto*, in desire and intention. Most faithfully, then, does she copy His practice, in exercising the marvellous power confided to her, of healing the leprosy of the soul.

3. It would seem to us even more superfluous than in our last illustration of sacramental penance to trace the resemblance between its exercise and the raising by our Lord of the dead to life. A few brief remarks will suffice to sketch it, as peculiarly belonging to us.

One of the offices of the Holy Spirit in the

---

* 2 Reg. xii. 13.

Church is to "convince the world of sin,"* that is, among other effects, to give a right understanding of its nature. In the Old Law it was merely considered as a transgression, a violation of a precept, for which anger and punishment were to be expected from God. The inward havoc of sin in the soul is not to be found described or alluded to, even in the fervent outpourings of sorrow which David first manifested. The spiritual life, as we have before observed, was but obscurely and imperfectly understood. If we may use so strong an expression, sin, once committed, was external to the sinner, it was a reckoning which he had to make with God. It lay at his door,† it would be a lion on his path,‡ but it was not the inward domestic enemy; it was not disease, canker, blight and ruin. With the doctrine of Grace, which Christianity first revealed, came the knowledge that the soul has a life by that gift, the loss of which involves spiritual death. And Grace is forfeited by deadly sin. This is a language familiar to a Catholic child, taught in every catechism; hence, to the eye of faith, a soul in such guilt is as truly dead as is a corpse to that of the body: and the contemplation of it moving amidst the occupations and affections of life presents as hideous a spectacle as would a body with unmoving features, sunless eyes, blanched lips, and icy limbs, gliding silent through the merry dance.

---

* John xvi. , 9.

† Gen. iv. 3.

‡ Ecclus. xxvii. 11, 31; xxviii. 27.

There is a reality attached to this thought of spiritual death, in a Catholic mind, which shows itself in many ways. For example, a mother like St. Monica does not express "her regret that her dear son should be so wild, but hopes he will become steadier," as many a modern parent would speak of the *vices* of a son, and think she had paid a tribute to virtue; but she weeps bitter tears, and follows him from land to land, and fasts and prays, and pines in grief; and why? Her son expresses it to the life: "Me multos annos fleverat, ut oculis suis viverem."* She believed, nay she knew, him to be spiritually dead; and she wept over him as a widow does over her dead only child. Hence, the Church most becomingly appropriates to her festival (May 4th) the history of Christ's raising the son of the widow of Naim,† as beautifully symbolical of the conversion of her son; and further reads his own commentary upon it, in the office, applying the narrative to the restoration of the soul to life. And what else is the secret of penitent grief, such as St. John Climacus describes among the solitaries of Egypt, such as every Charter-house or Cistercian abbey could exhibit, and yet does; where men who have every reason to hope that pardon has been vouchsafed them will continue, for long years, to mourn and do penance; but that deep earnest conviction of sin and its detestable enormity, which makes them loathe its defilement, abhor its impiety, and dread its deadly stroke? which from very love of God makes the estrangement from Him which it causes, the deadly cold obstruction which it opposes to his life-giving graces, a state as fearful as that of bodily dissolution and corruption?

---

* Confess. lib. ix. c. 12.

† Luke vii. 11.

This sentiment is not to be found in Protestantism; it is contrary to its very first principles. First, such effects as we have described are not witnessed nor approved there. To weep, to mourn, to afflict the body, to fast, are *works*, and are familiarly considered opposed to justification by faith. Hence there is no provision for them; no religious solitudes, no penitential communities, are to be found where Protestantism prevails. As things to be plundered, stripped and beaten down, it knows of them; but not as things to be admired and upheld. Hence, secondly, it is astonishing how easily a load of sins is supposed, in the Protestant, and consequently in the Anglican, system, to be got rid of. Suppose a man, a noble one for example, to have been notorious, through years, for open and scandalous vice, addicted to shameless immoralities before the world: well, if growing gray, he begins to go about the neighborhood in his phaeton, leaving Bibles at every cottage, and giving tracts to every village dame, and fits up the family pew, and becomes president of the county auxiliary Bible Society, and presides at May meetings in the season, the scarlet of his youthful sins becomes at once white as his locks of snow; and no one, any more than himself, thinks of sorrow and tears, as having been necessary to make him —a saint. But, thirdly, we find a marked abhorrence in Protestant writers of the distinction between mortal and venial sin. They reject the very idea of there being such a thing: they hold the Stoic maxim that "all sins are equal."* What is the necessary consequence? That there is no apprehension of any deadly character in *any* sin. For who can bring himself to imagine that a passing thought of anger, or a hurried word of impatience, or a trifling act of unkindness, kills the soul and robs it of grace? Then, how can the more grievous act of deliberate crime do so, seeing that it is no greater sin? There is only one escape, that such failings as we have mentioned are not sins at all; and hence comes a dulness of conscience, and a heaviness of perception, respecting sin, which soon extends to more heinous transgressions. For the greatest security against mortal, is the dread of venial offences.

The view, then, of sin, which makes death its most perfect symbol, even in this life, is distinctly Catholic. And thus the raising of the dead is most eminently representative, with us, of the ministerial power to forgive the sinner. Hence, in the three instances of resurrection recorded in the Gospel, there is scarcely a circumstance related which does not strike the Catholic's mind as containing an analogy with what he sees in the sacrament of penance. And they whose ministry is employed in it will, more than others, feel the resemblances. We will rapidly enumerate them.

---

* Cicero, *Paradoxa.*

1. There are three dead raised, each of whom represents a different class of sinners. The first is just dead—the beginning of sin: the second is being carried to the grave—the commencing of habitual transgression: the third is buried and lying in corruption—the obstinate and forgetful sinner. With each of these the priest has to deal; and he finds in each a practical lesson.

2. The first is indeed a corpse, but the minstrel and the multitude are still around it—the world and its vanities ministering to the dead spirit! When he that would raise it to life approaches it, and speaks of his wish, they laugh him to scorn. They must be put away; silence and quiet are necessary to raise the soul. Peter is there with his keys, James with his earnest zeal, and John with his gentle charity. A kindly hand is stretched out, and in the power of that hand the dead one rises. And what shall be done next with her, that is, with the soul? He who has raised her "bids them give her to eat."* As there was a banquet when the prodigal returned, as there was feasting and rejoicing when the stray sheep was brought back, so surely must there be a rich and dainty repast to refresh the dear daughter of the house restored to life. Did the mother spare, that day, her sweetest confections? Did the ruler of

---

* Matt. ix. 23; Luke viii. 55. Compare the two accounts.

the synagogue stint of his richest cellarage to warm his child's frame, or to make his congratulating guests rejoice? And shall the Church, to whose motherly care the revived soul is committed, be less parent-like than they? Will not she have her banquet too, ready? and for the hour, is not she the dearest to her who has been the most cruelly severed from her of her children? and is not the feast for her especially? Surely so, as it was for the prodigal. And how strange, but how beautiful, that, as if intending to show us the identity of the two lessons, in the parable and the miracle, our Lord should have made the prodigal's father say: "Let us eat and make merry; because *this my son was dead, and is come to life again*; was lost, and is found."* The dead raised, and the prodigal returned, are one and the same: and both must be refreshed and feasted. This is, indeed, what the Catholic Church alone understands.

3. The second has left home, the house of the weeping mother: strong ones are bearing him to the grave. A stronger hand must arrest them in this cruel errand. At its touch, they that carry must needs stand still: a more powerful command is uttered, and the dead youth rises from his bier. What shall be done with *him?* What the Samaritan did with the poor wounded man, after he had dressed his wounds. He gave him in charge to the innkeeper, to provide for all his wants. And here there is one by, the one by whose tears Jesus was

---

* Luke xv. 24.

moved to exert His power, far better than the innkeeper—for she is his mother. "And He gave him to his mother."* There is something inexpressibly sweet in this expression. Was he not hers before? Had death broken the filial tie, and did it need to be renewed? No, but a new and tenderer relation was established: by birth she had rights over him; but the second life which Jesus bestowed was His: and His rights He resigned to her. He was to be doubly her child, because he was a second time given to her by Him: and he had, from henceforward, to pay to her the gratitude, the obedience, and the filial love which He might have claimed for Himself. Yes, truly; He has given repentant sinners to His Church, as the tenderest part of her charge. And to the ear of loving children there is an undersound in this phrase mystically soothing and consoling. "And He gave him to his mother," sounds so like a prelude to the sweetest words ever uttered on Calvary! For how else could He *give* a son to his mother, but by saying:—"Woman, behold thy son?"†

4. Finally, Lazarus has been four days in the grave: "Quatriduanus est, jam fœtet," say his own sisters, who are not likely to exaggerate the foulness of his condition. And here groans and supplications are necessary, and the uplifting of heavy obstructions, and the drawing forth from corruption of the dead thing that once was a liv-

---

* Luke vii 15.

† John xix. 26.

ing man, by a strong command; and then comes the loosing him from his bands, as he starts to life. How distinctly allusive to the power to bind and to loose are these words: "And presently he that had been dead came forth, *bound* feet and hands with winding-bands, and his face was *bound* about with a napkin. Jesus said to them: *Loose* him, and let him go."* He did not do so Himself, but He commissioned others. *They* have to loose for Him those bound in the *laquei mortis*,—"the toils of death." And where do we next meet Lazarus? Precisely where we might expect. At Bethania "they made Jesus a supper, and Martha served; but *Lazarus was one of them that was at table with Him*."† It is always the same—the banquet for the recovered dear one. But here it is quite defined: he who a few days before was dead, was lying reeking in corruption—even he is at table with Jesus. O holy, sweet, loving Church of God! How we recognize thee at every step, in the workings of love divine among men! Unchanged as Himself, thy Spouse and Master, forgetting not one of His examples, dropping not one of His blessed words, how dost thou renew, day by day, the beauty of His character reflected in thee, and the splendor of His institutions, ever fresh in thy right hand!

It is an invidious, and we sincerely believe a hopeless task, to examine the claims of others to similar coincidences. They may say that all these minute comparisons are fanciful and arbitrary. There is an easy test. Show that they can be made in some other system, and we will own it. If not, whence comes it that the Catholic system alone,—yea, the corrupt, the superstitious, the silly, the unspiritual system of Popery,—should furnish throughout, not a faint resemblance, but a minute, distinct, and lively counterpart to what our Saviour did in His greatest works on earth?

---

* John xi. 44.

† Ib. xii. 2.

III. *Extreme Unction.*—It is worthy of note that St. Mark, who generally is considered to follow closely St. Matthew, should alone have preserved for us three instances of cures by external rites. Two we have already seen, in the restoring to health of a blind, and of a deaf and dumb, man.* The third remains; and to Catholics is most interesting. It is the following: —The apostles "cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them."† This calls to mind the well-known text of St. James: "Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him."‡ The resemblance of this text of St. Mark's narrative suggests at once to the Catholic the type of Extreme Unction in these first apostolic miracles. A few remarks will here suffice.

---

* Mark vii. 34.; viii. 23. † Ib. vi. 13 ‡ James v. 14.

1. We do not find recorded anywhere directions from our Saviour to His apostles to use this means of cure. Yet though three Evangelists (including St. Mark) give us in detail His instructions, and this practice of anointing is not mentioned by any, we cannot hesitate for a moment to believe that it was prescribed by Himself. This will show us how His institution must be assumed in other cases, where we find practised by His disciples what we do not read to have been commanded. When, therefore, St. James enjoins, unhesitatingly, the anointing by the priest, as to be followed by remission of sins; as we must suppose the miraculous cures wrought by the unction to be proof of divine appointment, so we may well conclude that the more wonderful effect of forgiveness of sins could not have been attributed to the same act, unless an equally supreme sanction and promise had been attached to it. It was, therefore, a sacramental action: and, as such, permanent.

2. We may consider this an established principle, that what was instituted for men's souls was to remain; what was instituted for their temporal benefits was temporary. We have an example in the appointment of deacons. On the face of the institution it was to serve a merely casual and secular purpose, "to serve tables," or distribute alms.* But it becomes evident from St. Paul's description of the diaconal character† that they who received it were invested with an ecclesiasti-

---

* Acts vi. 2.

† 1 Tim. iii. 8.

cal dignity; and they were ordained by imposition of the apostles' hands.* The Anglican establishment has reasoned wisely in this case that, though the temporal functions of the deacons have ceased, it does not follow that the institution itself ended with them, even though they were the immediate cause of the appointment. What was temporal was temporary, and no longer continues; but the spiritual gifts and duties subsist to the end. In like manner it has reasoned rightly (though it has sadly failed in application of its reasoning) that what was *purely* miraculous in divine commission was a personal gift to the apostles; what was of spiritual benefit to the Church was to descend to their successors. But it could not see in St. James's text the same distinction, and separate the spiritual benefits of forgiveness of sins from the raising up of the sick man; and consider the one as enduring, the other as, *perhaps*, temporary. Yet a clear analogy would have led any one of sense, unblinded by puritanical hatred of forms, so to conclude.

3. But the Catholic Church has no need of such explanations. She takes the text as it is; as the fulfilment of the whole of Christ's promise. The apostles are to do His works, and greater than His visible works; and in the Catholic doctrine of Extreme Unction this is believed by us to be done. That bodily health is frequently restored by it, no experienced priest doubts from his own observation, independently of the Church's teaching.

---

* Acts vi. 6.

This is the work equal to Christ's. That sins are forgiven by the sacrament no Catholic is allowed to doubt. This is the work greater than men saw Him do on earth. It was the same when St. James wrote. The miraculous, the visible, the striking effect was allowed to continue the more marked and attractive. But who that judges, "comparing spiritual things with spiritual,"* will for a moment imagine that in St. James's mind the raising to health could have been considered a primary effect of any institution or rite, which at the same time gave pardon of sin? Or that this, when certain of effect, and consequently most salutary to man, could ever have been held secondary to the healing of the body? Those who have seen that beautiful spectacle, the sudden kindling up of St. Peter's in Rome, at Easter night's illumination, will remember how in each lamp was a heap of light inflammable materials, which, touched by the torch, instantly blazed brilliantly forth, but quickly faded. This was not the lamp destined to burn through the night, but was only meant to light this up. For when the first flash had subsided, the steady light which succeeded it, though far less dazzling, fed upon unfailing nourishment, and, in spite of wind or rain, burnt unflinching to the end. Such was this, such were other institutions. Two lights were kindled at the same moment; but one obscured, or over-shone the other. The first was the brilliant, miraculous gift; that of tongues in Confirmation, that of healing in Extreme Unction. These gifts were made for a time, and proved the reality of that constant, perpetual grace which was for the while obscured by them. And when they were withdrawn, they left that other undying flame burning as brightly as at the beginning; for its invisible, unfailing oil, is the unction of the Anointed.

---

* 1 Cor. ii. 13.

IV. *The Blessed Eucharist.*—It would indeed have been strange if miracles had been wanting to foreshow the miracle of spiritual miracles. But there are such, and most splendid, most perfect, and most beautifully illustrative of the Catholic doctrine. We will dwell upon these, though not at the length which the importance of the subject deserves.

1. Our blessed Lord Himself has furnished us with a clue to the connection between the first and His own institution. He who did nothing without a design, intended to communicate His doctrine respecting this food of life, and by way of preliminary He led the people into the wilderness like Moses, and there miraculously fed them. Five thousand men, besides women and children, were fully satisfied with five loaves and two fishes. Nor was the feast exhausted. Twelve baskets of fragments of bread remained; and who doubts that these would have sufficed, as well as the original loaves, to feed as many more? The people saw the analogy between this feast and that of manna in the desert: and through it, our Saviour

led them to His heavenly discourse on the Blessed Eucharist. The three first Evangelists record this miracle, but not the doctrinal teaching which resulted from it.* Two of them relate a similar miracle, where four thousand were similarly fed.† The repetition of a miracle of such magnitude seems intended, as it is calculated, to fix our thoughts upon it.

First: We must be struck with the motive of the miracle—it was compassion: "I have compassion on the multitude." Who but the Catholic familiarly calls the Eucharist the "Sacrament of Love?" It is to others a commemorative right, intended to revive the memory of Christ's passion. But as an outpouring of divine affection, as the communication of God's love to man, it is only by us that it is regarded. We consider it instituted out of compassionate love for man, as medicine, as food, as a dainty, as support, as treasures, to strengthen and cheer him in the desert of this barren life.

Secondly: This miracle was not an individual one; not a prerogative or favor. It required no particular state, beyond appetite or desire, to receive it. Food was given to the strong man as to the feeble, to the healthy as to the sickly, to the young as to the old, to the rich as to the poor. One relished it keenly, another barely took it as sustenance; one enjoyed its flavor, another seemed scarcely to taste it. One expressed himself warmly in gratitude, another appeared barely thankful. But there it was for all, for the mere asking; and when it was over, it was hardly a thing to talk about. One would hardly boast of having partaken of that bread, as one would of having been restored to sight by Jesus; and men would not have gone to a distance to see a person who had eaten of that miraculous food, as they went to Bethania to see Lazarus raised from the dead.* And this, because the miracle left no visible evidence after it; because it was for the benefit of so many (which only made it the greater), and because it bore such a homely aspect. Such also is the feeling with regard to the blessed Eucharist. Its wonderful mysterious effects do not strike, nor, unhappily, excite the gratitude and admiration it deserves. But, like the bread of the desert, it is the food for all—"sumit unus, sumunt mille"—and it is partaken of by all manner of characters,—the fervent and the lukewarm, the strong in grace and the feeble in desire, the rich in virtue, and the poor.

---

* Matt. xiv. 15; Mark vi. 42; Luke ix. 16; John vi. 11.

† Matt. xv. 32; Mark viii. 6.

Thirdly: In this miracle our Saviour does not act beyond, by His blessing, multiplying the bread. Its distribution He leaves to His apostles. They arrange the throng, they carry round the food, they give to each his share, they satisfy all, they treasure up the fragments; and lo! wonder of wonders! they reserve as much as they began with—the self-same food is ready for the next comers; and they may come in thousands, and it shall suffice.

---

* John xii. 9.

Fourthly: The miracle thus meets one of the most popular objections against the Catholic doctrine concerning this sacrament, that many partake of the same food at the same time—"nec sumptus consumitur." For it is not said that our Lord created new bread, nor dilated what there was, so to speak. From beginning to end of the banquet they were the same five loaves and two fishes which were eaten by this hungry crowd, and the fragments left would have made up the same loaves and fishes again. Any other theory alters the character of the miracle. It would not be that our Lord fed 5,000 people *with five loaves*, but that having *but* five loaves, he created, say 4,995 more, to give each person one. In that case, there being five loaves at the beginning had nothing to do with the miracle; this consists in the creating of the others. Then, according to the Gospel narrative, more than five thousand persons were actually eating the same food, and each one had enough, and it was not consumed. How was this? The Catholic answer is plain and simple; in the same manner as it happens every day in the Blessed Eucharist. One miracle is a counterpart to the other.

2. Another great objection to the Catholic doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist is directed against Transubstantiation. The change of one substance

into another seems opposed to all our notions. And yet we believe modern chemistry is fast approaching to conclusions which will greatly modify that old pretended contradiction of science. Such a change is no doubt miraculous; and against this perpetuation of miracles Protestantism protests. But that is of its essence. Our dear Lord, therefore, was pleased to make the evidencing of such a transubstantiation His very first miracle.* We will make but a few remarks upon it.

First: It was at a feast that He was first pleased to manifest Himself to the world. It was by a feast that He closed His ministerial career. At that first feast at Cana He emerged from His first state, His hidden life; at the second He passed again into its last stage, its sorrowful and afflicted close. The first was a marriage feast; and what was the last? Let loving spouses, like St. Catherine, or St. Rose, or St. Juliana, answer. What must that feast be, at which, for the first time, is poured forth the "vinum germinans virgines?" How like are these two feasts!

Secondly: At the first feast the wine fails. Of water there is abundance; but the nobler beverage is wanting. How is the desire of the guests to be satisfied? By changing the ignoble into the noble, the water into wine. Here is the first stage of change, the first exercise of the transmuting power. What must the next naturally be? Wine was the richest, most generous, most invigorating of nature's productions. Earth could yield nothing more excellent than the vine and its fruit. The water which filtering through the earth is caught by its roots, elaborated into its sap, distilled into its grape, and there sweetened by the sun, is raised in nature and qualities in the estimation of men. Our blessed Lord, by one simple action, gave it that higher existence. Then *it* must now be changed again at the second feast. And for whom? For *us* who want—not wine, not earthly growth of any sort. Man was surfeited of that, and called for better refreshment. If the first transubstantiation was so great and so worthy of the power that made it, what shall we find, into which the wine itself shall be changed? There is but one stream, a draught from which would refresh, renew, revive our fainting race; but who shall dare to ask it? It was of "the water out of the cistern that is in Bethlehem" (the house of bread), that David longed to drink; but he shuddered to partake, saying: "The Lord be merciful to me, that I may not do this: shall I drink the blood of these men?"* And it is from the well-spring of Bethlehem that we too thirst to drink; but we must not shrink from the awful draught—the priceless *blood* of Him that opens it. No, there is only one change more that can be made; the wine must become a living flow from His divine heart. Only thus shall the second feast surpass the first.

---

* John ii. 9.

* 2 Reg. xxiii. 17.

Thirdly: But it will be said, "In the first miracle the change was visible, was tested by the senses; in the second, as Catholics believe it, this evidence is wanting. Here your parallel fails." Quite the contrary. Hereby is shown the superiority of the second miracle. That which is worthy of a miracle to be its type is proved thereby of a higher nature. If in the Eucharist the transubstantiation were sensible, there would have needed none to precede it at Cana. The latter would have been so far useless. But it is a much greater and higher miracle to have a change made and yet concealed, than to have a visible and patent mutation. The latter could not be an object of faith; and objects of sense belong to the inferior order. The change was once made visibly, that God's power should be manifested whenever He should please to make it invisibly. They who gainsay it in the latter case, say to Him: "Let it be as it was at Cana, and we will believe Thee; but in our theory they only are blessed who believe because they see."*

3. The Eucharist, according to Catholic doctrine, perpetuates the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ on earth. He is in it, God and man, in

---

* Of *Matrimony* we will content ourselves with saying, that the Catholic rite is singularly and beautifully interwoven with the Mass or Eucharistic sacrifice, only similarly interrupted for the hallowing of the sacramental oils; as though to copy our Lord's example, of uniting the marriage-feast with the foreshadowing of the sacrament of the altar.

the fulness of His perfections. One remarkable quality of His sacred Person, when he lived a visible man, was, that virtue ever went from Him, and healed all.* This unceasing flow of miraculous energy, this atmosphere of life which invested Him as with a robe of majesty, the Church verifies, and may be said daily to feel. It is indeed hard to make this understood, for it belongs to the hidden influences of religion, more to be felt than to be expressed. But devout souls will know our meaning; they will have experienced the fervor, the peace, the confidence, the love which the mere presence of the Blessed Sacrament inspires, in prayer and meditation: the soothing and tranquillizing influence which it has on their troubled and agitated or anxious minds. What religious community would stand the privation of this society? On what would the chaste love of the spouses of Jesus live, if they had not Him near them, and if, after the Martha-like duties of their charity towards men, they could not often take the place of Mary at His feet, and there, in silent contemplation of His mercy, and graciousness and loveliness, repair the slight distractions of the day, and refill their lamps with that love of God which burns outwardly as charity for man?

That this influence of this adorable mystery is real, and not imaginary, is proved by its effects on those who know nothing of it. We could mention several cases of conversion from it; we will content ourselves with two, because we received them both from the mouths of those whom they regard.

---

* Matt. ix. 20; xiv. 36; Mark iii. 10; v. 30; Luke viii. 46.

The first is that of the late worthy and pious priest, the Rev. Mr. Mason. He had been a Wesleyan preacher for some years, and we heard him declare in a public sermon, to a large congregation, that his conversion was due mainly to this; that whenever he entered a Catholic church or chapel, he felt himself awed, hushed to silence, and compelled to kneel in adoration, though no worship was going on; whereas, in his own meeting house, he never experienced any such feelings. Yet he was totally unconscious of the cause; and when he learnt the Catholic belief and practice, in regard to the Blessed Eucharist, he was so convinced of the adequacy of the cause of his emotions, that he hesitated not to yield to their evidence, and became a Catholic.

The second is that of the Baroness K——, well known to many for her abilities, her piety, and her many good works. She was a German Protestant, strongly imbued with prejudices against the Catholic religion. Coming to Rome, she entered the church of the Perpetual Adoration, where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed to worship the whole day. She saw many people, in silent prayer, bowed down, or gazing intently towards the altar. Ignorant of the object which engaged their attention, observing only a multitude of lights upon the altar, but as yet without sense of His presence, "who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks,"* she exclaimed: "Good God! surely these people are not adoring those tapers!" But she found herself, in spite of herself, gently forced upon her knees, and compelled to worship—she knew not what. She returned again and again, marvellously attracted, and ever with the same effect. It was a year before she discovered the truth, and became aware Who was there; and with gushing tears did she deplore to us that year, as she called it, of grace resisted and of time lost.

To some, perhaps to many, of our readers, these things will sound foolish and fanatical; but there is a phrase that accounts for this. When Nathaniel would not believe that the Messiah could come from Nazareth, "Philip saith to him, *Come and see*."† And to this there is a corresponding one in the Old Testament: "Taste and see how sweet is the Lord."‡ We have known a convert whom God soon transferred from her life of suffering, but of joy, here below, to one of unclouded bliss above, whom conversion at once changed from a pleasure-seeking worldling, into a devout and cheerful servant of God; who, when debarred herself from approaching to holy communion, would gently draw close to those who came from receiving it, and feel a glow of comfort and a ray of happiness shed into her own heart—the virtue going forth from the sacred humanity of Jesus, even though lodged in a frail tabernacle of clay.

---

* Apoc. ii. 1. † John ii. 40. ‡ Ps. xxxiii. 9.

> "Expertus potest credere
> Quid sit Jesum diligere."

But if this experience of the children of the household be scarcely intelligible to those without, what shall we say of another experience, most awful to think of—that of fear of this latent virtue? It will be hardly credited, but we know it on the best authority, that persons wavering in the Anglican establishment, and leaning strongly towards Catholicity, are forbidden, by what they call their directors, ever to enter into any chapel in which the Blessed Sacrament is kept! In other words, they fear lest Jesus Christ Himself, in whose presence they profess to believe, should entice them by His sweetness, from a system which has lost Him. They dare not trust one of their flock to *His* guidance!

But, drawing now our remarks to a close, we will observe that in the Catholic Church all is true, real, and consistent. Not a promise of our Lord's there falls through. If He gave the power of miracles to His Apostles, it was coupled with the greater power of working spiritual wonders; and while that first faculty is not withdrawn, but reserved for occasions that require it, the other is permanent and of daily use. The Catholic mind becomes as familiar with this, as we all do with the wonders of nature. "My Father worketh until now; and I work,"* says our divine

---

* John v. 17.

Redeemer. Their work is one, but its operations are divided. What the Father doth in the order of nature, the Son performs in the order of grace. To us, each is equally real, as equally invisible. The One speaks to the waters of the deep, and they teem with life, and send forth the birds, and the creeping things of the earth; the Other breathes upon them, and they give to grace a new progeny, a regenerated humanity. The One commands the winds, and they pass over the earth, rough or gentle at will, but always cleansing, renewing, and recreating; the Other sends His Spirit upon the soul, and He, breathing where and how He willeth, purges, and frees from corruption the spiritual being, and renovates its fading life. The One, with kindly look, lights up the heavens with gladness, and feeds the sun's unfailing radiance; the Other casts His fire upon the earth, and straightway it is enkindled: it sparkles through the soul, like a vivid electric dart in the youth, as he kneels to receive the Holy Ghost; it is strongly but steadily lighted in the sacerdotal breast, for a beacon, set on high, to guide frail barks to a safe haven; as a furnace, in which every passion has to be consumed and every virtue annealed; as a cheering domestic glow, round which the child and the old man will gladly gather for warmth. The One diffuses life through all nature; sends His seasons and their various energies to earth; distributes its shower and its dew, vivifies the corrupting grain, and makes it shoot forth bread for man, and sends through the plant its nourishing juices, to come out first fair in blossom, and then salubrious in fruit: the Other sows on earth a corn and a wine, that gladden the heart of man; scatters His harvest and His vintage over His Church, and with their unfailing succulency feeds, sustains, cheers, and refreshes the unseen world of the spirit, the immortal part and being of man.

We can see nothing to disbelieve in the one, more than in the other series of marvellous operations,—God is in both; the same power, the same wisdom, and the same love. This is the Catholic's simple thought; he believes the order of grace to be as real as that of nature; holds the existence of a spiritual, as much as of a physical, life. He believes that Jesus Christ has promised to be *with* His Church *all days* to the end of the world;* and he cannot understand this in any other sense, than in one becoming Him, as promising, not a distant superintendence, nor an occasional assistance, but a close and intimate association, and a daily by-standing, to borrow an expressive word.† *Ego operor*,—"I work," is His invaluable word; and this accounts for any amount of superhuman agency in the Church. "Peter baptizes," says St. Augustine;—"it is Christ that baptizes. Judas baptizes; it is Christ that baptizes." And so it is in all other sacramental mysteries. The hand that blesses is

---

* Matt. xxviii. 20. † *Beistand* (Germ.) assistance.

Christ's; the hand that consecrates is Christ's; the hand that anoints is Christ's; the hand that absolves is Christ's;—the same hand that touched the eyes, and they saw; that was laid on the sick, and they arose; that took hold of the dead, and he lived. This realization in fact of our divine Lord's presence in His Church, as an active daily, and hourly truth, forms the difference between Catholic and Protestant belief on the Church. Thus Protestants can imagine the Church disunited—the note of unity in abeyance, as was lately said—then Christ is not there. For He cannot be disunited. His presence must be conceived to be a mere theoretical one, not an incorporation of Himself with the Church. They can believe her, even in general councils, to err. Then Christ is not really there *with* her. He is not truly in the midst of the more than two or three gathered together in His name. They can believe in no inherent virtue in the Blessed Eucharist, and repudiate its adoration. Then He is not truly there present. In fine, they have no confidence in their own sacerdotal functions; they *dare* not ask for absolution from *any* clergyman, but only from certain initiated men, like those admitted to the mysteries of old: then Christ is not in the ministerial act, but comes into it through the godliness of the minister. But, to the Catholic, this assistance is actual on our Lord's part; it is not a theory, but a fact; and he believes in it as naturally as he does in God's providence, of which it is only a specific operation. Hence these wonderful effects of the Church's ministrations cease to be in his eyes miracles; they are only dispensations of grace.

And in truth, if further we consider what is a miracle, we shall find that it bears a twofold aspect,—the Jewish and the Christian. The perversity of the Jews consisted in a call for signs that could be *seen*. "Unless you *see* signs and wonders, you believe not,"* was our Saviour's reproach to them. "Master," they ask, "we wish to *see* a sign from you."† This was the lowest stage of belief; and could only lead to knowledge of that inferior class of wonders which meets the senses. To this alone Protestantism is able to reach; and even in that it stands on so slippery a downward descent, that it easily falls over into the gulf of rationalism and infidelity. It calls ever out for the testimony of its eyes, just like the Jews. But the Christian rule of faith is very different. "Faith comes from *hearing*,"‡ and not from seeing; and this is the Catholic evidence. By this alone the true wonders of God can be found; by this only are the real miracles of revelation discovered. The Jewish shepherd looked at the manger in Bethlehem, and contemplated its miracles with awe. The heavens had opened to him, and its radiant host had sung for him a wonderful hymn of jubilee; a brilliant star had glided from the east athwart the firmament, and had drawn after it the kings of earth.

---

* John iv. 47. † Matt. xii. 38. ‡ Rom. x. 17.

But to the Christian eye, the real miracle is, that the child in that manger, between an ox and an ass, is "true God of true God, begotten, not made, consubstantial to the Father, by whom all things were made." Before this knowledge, which the sight reveals not, all seen marvels sink into insignificance.

When Jesus was brought before Herod, he wished to *see* Him perform a miracle,* and Jesus refused to gratify his insolent curiosity. What fitting miracle could He have wrought under such circumstances? He might most justly have struck the profligate idiot with blindness, as St. Paul did Elymas;† and it would have been a just punishment, as well as a true sign. Yet a sign was wrought before him, and a wonder that made angels weep with amazement; and we see it, but that worthless infidel did not. It was the eternal Wisdom clad in a fool's coat, and the Son of God, mocked by a stupid rabble of courtiers—and no fire came down from heaven on them.

When, finally, the cross is raised on Calvary, and the sun is darkened, and the earth quakes, and the mountains are rent, and the veil of the temple is torn, and the dead arise; here surely are miracles and signs enough to satisfy even a Jew's gaping curiosity. But the Christian heeds them not: the greatest of miracles is on that cross. The eclipsing of that Sun of Justice;—the quivering of His frame;—the breaking of His heart;—the rending of His humanity;—the death of a God;—absorb all other thoughts and feelings, and make Redemption, the marvel of marvels, alone attended to.

---

* Luke xxiii. 8.

† Acts xiii. 8.

In perfect consistency with this principle, is the Catholic view of the miracles of the new Testament. They are the noble, and the most perfect counterpart of the unseen wonders of the Christian dispensation.

NOTES ON THE PRECEDING ESSAY.

A.

In republishing this paper, I will add a few notes, to explain more minutely what is popularly stated in the text; as this version has not been much studied.

Ps. lxxviii. (*Heb.*), v. 74 in *Ar.*, 69 *Heb.* and *Gr.* The Hebrew has ויבן כמו־רמים וגו׳, which is translated by the Septuagint, *και ῳκοδομησεν ως μονοκερωτον, κ. τ. λ.* Now the Arabic has اسس علي العلما—"He founded upon high." It is clear this cannot be a translation from the Greek. Again, we may ask, whence could the words "*founded upon*" be taken? From the Hebrew; by changing the ב into כ in יבן, which thus becomes יכן, "he *founded*;" and the כ into ב in כמו; which thus becomes במו, "*upon*," instead of "*as*."

The second illustration alluded to in the text is found in the translation of the word רמים. The Greek translator considered it identical with ראמים. According to the Greek, this word occurs four times in the Psalms: twice it is written fully with an א inserted, twice defectively. The two instances of the first case are Ps. xxix. 6, and xcii. (*Heb.*) 10, *Ar* 11. In the first of these places the

Arabic has the very word of the Hebrew, الريم, on which ample details will be found in Bochart's Hierozoicon, vol. ii. p. 335. In the second it gives an accurate translation of the Greek word used in both texts—*μονοκερως*, by rendering it وحيد القرن "the one-horned."

The instances of defective orthography of the word are Ps. xxii. 21, *Ar.* 22, and lxxviii. 74: and here the word presents the form רמים, resembling the plural of רם, "high." Now, though in both these places the Septuagint version has *μονοκερως*, the Arabic has *high*. In the first passage it reads, "and from the horn *raised* upon my lowliness." On the second text, I have already remarked that the translator seems to have had the Hebrew before him; and this confirms it: for here again he translates by *high*.—"He has founded on high." And although Aquila has *ὑψηλως*, and Symmachus *ὡς τα ὑψηλα*, yet neither of these is represented in our version.

It appears, therefore, that in the two places where the word is written full, the Arabic version agrees with the Greek; where it is defective, it gives a translation only derivable from the Hebrew. It is right, however, to mention that the same phenomenon is to be found in the Syriac Peshito.

The Arabic version published by Walton in his Polyglot agrees with the LXX in all four places.

B.

This verse suggests an interesting critical discussion, affecting not only the Arabic version, but the Vulgate. The Hebrew has כרית לי אזנים, "Thou has pierced [or opened] mine ears."

The Septuagint, followed by St. Paul (Heb. x. 5), *Σωμα δε κατηρτισω μοι.*

The Vulgate has, "Aures autem perfecisti mihi."

Finally, the Arabic version before us,—

صنعق لي جسدا وفتحت مسامعي

"Thou hast made me a body, and Thou hast opened mine ears."

To begin with the Vulgate. Through the entire Psalm, it is evidently translated from the Greek, without the slightest intervention of the Hebrew. Yet in this verse, and in it alone, it deserts the Greek, and, in part at least, approaches to the Hebrew. So likewise does the translator of St. Irenæus. But this approximation is more apparent, perhaps, than real. It seems to lie in two words,—"*aures*" and "*perfecisti.*"

1. *Aures.* The Mosarabic and Roman Psalters, St. Augustine, Cassiodorus, St. Ambrose, and St. Hilary, read *corpus.* It would thus appear that there is good authority for assimilating the text in this word to the Septuagint, and reading, "Corpus autem perfecisti mihi."

2. *Perfecisti.* All the Latin Fathers used this verb, whether they read *aures* or *corpus*, except St. Ambrose, who, once, in his Commentary, has *præparasti;* though in the same place he also, several times, reads *perfecisti.* This shows that he considered the two as nearly equivalents:— "Thou hast prepared, or perfected, a body for me." The same Greek verb occurs in the passage in St. Paul, where the Vulgate renders it by *aptasti:* which, again, has the same meaning:—"Thou hast fitted a body to me, or prepared a fitting body for me."

It follows that *perfecisti* corresponds to *κατηρτισω*, and not to כרית: for the Greek verb means sometimes in Scripture, "to *perfect;*" but the Latin verb never means to "*pierce.*" (*Vide* Schleusner *in voce.*) The Douay version, therefore, which renders it thus: "Thou hast pierced ears for me," is incorrect; and this instance might have been added to those given in the essay on "Catholic Versions."

Proceeding now to the Greek text, we find a variety of readings corresponding to that of the Latin version. Lambert Bos cites a Commentary as reading *Ωτια δε μοι κατηρτισω.* Nobilius gives all MSS. as unanimous in reading *σωμα*, except one. But more extensive inquiries have led to further discoveries. For in Parsons's (Holmes's) Septuagint, we have the following note:—*σωμα δε*] *ωτια δε*, 39; *ωτα δε*, 142, 156

(292 marg.). This gives us three MSS. that have "*ears*" in the text.* But all have the same verb, which can only have been applied to "*body*:" and we may therefore conclude that the more general is the correct reading.

And as the same reasoning applies to the Vulgate, we must conclude that originally it was in perfect accordance with the Greek, and the word *aures* is a modern variation.

Finally, to come to our Arabic, it is clear that the translator gives at full both the Hebrew and the Greek texts. And, what makes this more remarkable, the Polyglot version, before mentioned, does the same, though differing in words. I will observe that a connection between these two Arabic versions is traceable: for instance, in the Psalm before us, the two first verses are identical, except in two words; and the translation in both is peculiar:—"With patience I have hoped in the Lord."

C.

Vv. 13, 14, are as follows:—"Because He is thy God, Him thou shalt adore. The daughters of Tyre shall adore Him." Here, again, are two readings joined. The Hebrew has וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוִי־לוֹ, "adore Him," in the femin. imper. The LXX has *και προσκυνησουσιν αυτῳ θυγατερες* Τυρου. Vv. 10, 11, 15, 16 of this Psalm are quite unaccountable. I will give one curious translation in the first of these, which seems plainly to indicate the use of the Hebrew. The translator has made a pause at היכלי, or *βαρεων*: and to make sense, has added a suffix, as he sometimes does (*e. g.* Ps. lxxvii. 69, عليهم—which is neither in the Greek nor in the Hebrew; lvi. 2, lviii. 16). After this, he proceeds:—"The most noble ivory are the instruments of thy splendour" (combs, etc.).

---

* In the description of MSS., the ones here quoted are thus described:—39. Cod. Dorothei, ii. membr. sæc. ix.—142. Bib. Aulier. Vindob. Theol. x. membr. pervet. opt. notæ.—156. Bib. Basil. membr. 4º adm. antiq. sine accent. cum vers. lat. interl.—292. Cod. Bib. Medic. num. iii. Plut. vi. opt. notæ membr. in fol. sæc. xi.

The Hebrew for this is שֵׁן מִנִּי שִׂמְּחוּךָ׃ ; the word in construction with שֵׁן having been, as I have observed, detached from it. Now we cannot easily account for this translation, otherwise than by supposing our Arab to have taken מִנִּי for a plural noun in construction. In fact the Chaldaic מאן, *vas*, an "utensil," is frequently, if not always, written defectively, without the א in the Targum (*e. g.* Gen. xxiv. 53), and in construction would be מני, and correspond to the translation. The next word would necessarily be taken for a noun; and thus we have, "ivory are the instruments of thy gladness." In v. 18, we have the verb in the future, as in the Hebrew; while, in the Greek, it is in the past, without any variation of MS. or Father, except the *αλλος* of St. Chrysostom, who seems to be overlooked in Parsons's collection.

D.

It would be easy to bring a great many proofs of the use of the Peshito in this version. In the Psalm mentioned in the text, this use is continuous. Thus, v. 2, the Hebrew ערפל is translated in the Greek by *γνοφος*; in the Syriac by ܥܪ̈ܦܠܐ the same word as the Hebrew, only in the plural. Contrary to the Lexicons, this word means *clouds*, and not *darkness*. I base this translation on the following grounds: —1. The plural form, here used, excludes the latter meaning. 2. St. Ephrem uses the expression ܥܪ̈ܦܠܐ ܢܘܗܪ̈ܢܝܬܐ (Oper. tom. i. p. 9), which can only be translated "a *bright* cloud." Now to this Syriac version alone the plural Arabic وضبان corresponds.

V. 3. Hebrew תֵּלֵךְ׃, to which corresponds the Greek *προπορευσεται*; the Syriac ܬܐܟܘܠ *shall consume*; Arabic تتقد *shall burn.*

V. 10. The Greek *μισειτε* agrees with the Hebrew. The Syriac has ܣܢܝܢ *do hate*; so the Arabic يبغضون

V. 11. Heb. and Gr. *justis*; Syr. and Arab. *singular.*

To most readers all this will be highly uninteresting, and even unintelligible: but I will venture to offer to the consideration of biblical critics two more curious examples. Ps. cxxxix. (Heb.) 7:—"If I take the wings *of morning.*" The Greek has, "If I take my wings *κατ' ορθον*;" or, as the Alexandrine MS. more correctly reads, *κατ' ορθρον, in the morning* (Vulg. *diluculo*). Both the Syr. and Arab. read, "If I take the wings as the eagle's."

Ps. lxxix. (Heb.) 1. The Seventy translate צירם most peculiarly by *οπωροφυλακιον* (Vulg. *pomorum custodia*). The Syriac has ܡܚܪܒܬܐ *desolate.* The Arabic has combined the two readings, putting حرابا كالمحبس "*desolate*" (the same word as in the Syriac) "as a prison"—*φυλακιον.* (Can he have read *ὥσπερ φυλακιον*?)

It was by this frequent approximation to the Syriac, no doubt, that Michaelis, who calls our translator *Arabs Antiochenus,* was deceived into the idea that his version was made directly and entirely from the Peshito. See his edition of Castelli's Syriac Lexicon, in the words ܢܫܪܐ, ܨܦܪܐ, ܡܛܪܐ and ܐܬܚܪܒ.

THE

ACTIONS

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

[From the *Dublin Review* for Dec., 1851.]

Art. III.—1. *Jesus the Son of Mary; or, the Doctrine of the Catholic Church upon the Incarnation of God the Son, considered in its bearings upon the reverence shown by Catholics to his Blessed Mother.* By Rev. JOHN BRANDE MORRIS, M. A. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Toovey, 1851.

2. *Lettres Catholiques sur l' Evangile.—Catholic Letters on the Gospel.* By the ABBÉ MASSIOT, Paris: Dentu, 1851.

WHEN, some numbers back, we treated first of the parables,* and then of the Miracles, of the New Testament,† and showed how they could only receive their obvious explanation, as instructions, through the Catholic system, we felt that the same principle was applicable to all that our Redeemer said or did to make us wise unto salvation. To suppose that the less direct teaching of the Gospel belonged exclusively to the Spouse, and that the more immediate announcement of religious truth was common property to her and to her rivals, would indeed be an anomaly of reasoning, whereof we should be sorry to have any one suspect us. The miracle was for the unbelieving multitude; the parable was for the heartless priest and scribe; for friends and dear ones were the ordinary and domestic actions of Christ's earthly life; for apostles and disciples were His words of eternal life, the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. The Church that alone can claim succession, in ministry, in truth, in grace, and even in history, from these, must alone be entitled to appropriate to herself what was done and said for *them*. Others may stand in the skirts of the crowd, and listen; some may even penetrate into the inner circle that stands about Jesus, to interrogate, being doctors of the law, or to tempt, being pharisees. And if, like those who were sent to apprehend Him, but remained to listen to him, they attend with sincerity to His doctrines in parables and in mighty works, they will find them directed, as we have before seen, to force them into communion with, and submission to, the one, holy, and apostolic Church, in which alone His teaching ends, which alone His miracles illustrate.

---

* Vol. xxvii.

† Ibid.

But when the day's labor is closed, and no Nicodemus comes by night, to prolong it, before our heavenly Teacher retires to the mountain-top, or to His humble chamber, to pass the hours of repose in *His* rest, "the prayer of God," we see Him seated in the company of the few, of the faithful, and the loving; the Shepherd of the little flock, the Father of a slender household, partaking with them of their homely fare, and sharing with them in their untutored conversation. That His speeches to the multitude and to the priests were clothed in noble and elegant language, no one can doubt. The people admired not only the wisdom, but the grace, which flowed from His lips;* the learned, like Nicodemus, conversed with Him respectfully;† and all wondered at the gifts, ordinarily of education, spontaneously springing from the mind of a reputed carpenter's son.‡ But without repassing the ground trodden over in the first of the articles referred to, we will content ourselves with saying, that had the language, or accent, of our Saviour betrayed any symptoms of Galilean rudeness, the ridicule which might have been cast upon it would have been too keen and too useful a weapon, to have been refused by his unprincipled foes. The Jewish writers are unsparingly severe upon it. But when we come to contemplate our B. Redeemer, retired from the crowd into the society of His disciples and familiar friends, we cannot but see Him descend into the familiar dialect of His own country; as senators in Venice, or nobles in Provence, would do when in the bosoms of their families. With Peter, whose speech in the priest's hall made him known for a Galilean,* he would converse in those homely phrases, and with those local tones, which formed the language of the more favored cottage, as of the surrounding dwellings, of Nazareth, and which he condescended to lisp in infancy, as if caught from the sweet lips of His humble Mother. For affectation must be removed, as much as coarseness, from our estimate of His character, who chose to be poor among the poor.

---

* Luke iv. 22. † John iii. 2. ‡ Matt. xiii. 56.

And thus also we come to contemplate the frugal meal at which this heavenly conversation was held, as corresponding in its outer form and features. Rude furniture, in an unadorned chamber, rough-hewn tables and stools, the wooden platter, and the earthenware beaker, are the preparation for a repast of which the bread is not from Aser, † nor the wine from Engaddi. Yet what a banquet! Here it is that the parable is explained, and the want of faith censured; that contentions for precedence are checked, and deep lessons of charity and humility are taught; that, in fine, the mysteries of revelation are disclosed, and the gospel seed is dropped into warm and panting hearts.

Surely then, if the Church can claim the more mysterious teaching of adverse or curious crowds, as all directed for her improvement, she must have as fair a right to appropriate to herself that more intimate and direct instruction which was addressed to those whom she alone represents and succeeds on earth. And such is the teaching by actions and by words. To the first we shall confine ourselves in this paper, reserving the second to a future opportunity.

---

* Matt. xxvi. 43.

† Gen. xlix. 20

But though we have drawn a faint outline of our Lord's dealings with His apostles and friends by way of describing the scenes of familiar life in which we may find instruction, in so doing we have kept before us an ulterior view.

I. In fact, if "Christian" signifies a follower and disciple of Christ, one who looks up to his Master's example as a perfect model, there must, and will, be among those who bear that name many that will gladly copy whatever He has been pleased to do. To all, this may not be given, any more than it is granted them to resemble Him in His ministry, or in His sufferings, or in His more spiritual prerogatives. But as His type is not to be found reproduced in any one of His disciples, as John came nearest to Him in love, Peter in elevation and headship, Paul in eloquence, James in prayer, Andrew in death, and as in later times His sacramental grace lives in His priesthood, His patience in His martyrs, His union of soul with God in His holy virgins: so may we expect to find in some class of His chosen imitators this love and choice of poverty, this denudation of worldly comfort, and neglect of bodily ease. Our B. Redeemer is indeed a fount of burning light, the very sun of the spiritual firmament in His Church; and the rays that are concentrated with dazzling intensity in Him diverge, and are scattered over earth as they descend; and one is reflected back from one soul, and another from another, reproducing jointly the image of Himself; but each one brightly rendering back only one, though absorbing many more. Now if one of the virtues of our Lord was contempt of earthly things, and love necessarily of abjection, it must yet be reflected upon earth somewhere in His Church; and if this virtue be found only in one among contending parties, it surely will form a moral note, a seal of Christ not to be mistaken.

We imagined, for instance, just now, this heavenly teacher joining His disciples in their temperate repast, entertaining them meanwhile with that word, on which man lives, no less than upon bread.* Now let us descend eleven hundred years in time, and travel from Palestine to a more westerly region. There is a cleft in a mountain's side, down which, though most precipitous, and seemingly carved out by an ancient torrent, rarely a drop of water flows, into whose dismal avenue no songster of the grove is known to penetrate. Patched against the side of this gloomy glen, and rooted in its gray crags, is a dwelling half-built, half-excavated, which, at the period alluded to, had just been constructed. The inmates are at meat. Just enter in. Their refectory is low, dark, and damp, for one part of it has its walls of rock. All else is in admirable keeping: the tables and forms are scarcely less rugged. And what is on the former does not fall much behind. A few herbs from the impracticable garden, seasoned poorly, bread of the coarsest, and drink of the sourest, form the provision. At this are seated young men and old, all simply clad, of grave aspect and modest demeanor. One alone is not engaged as the rest. He is seated apart, and reads to them that eat. Let us listen to his words, which seem to rivet the attention of all, and give a dainty relish to their homely food. Is it from the "Romaunt of the Rose" that he is reading? Is he reciting scraps of minstrelsy, that tell of chivalrous deeds, or of some high-born dame on her ambling palfrey, escorted by a gallant knight? Something of the sort, forsooth; but sweeter, Oh! by far! From the Book of books he is reading, how, in cold winter, a gentle maiden rode from Nazareth to Bethlehem upon an ass, attended by a poor carpenter; and at her journey's end, lodged in a stable. At this simple tale, behold, he who presides puts away his frugal platter, and rises from his hard seat, trembling with emotion, his eyes glistening with tears, his hands clasped convulsively. What has caused this sudden outburst of grief? Why, he seems to himself a base poltroon, a dainty, delicate fellow, lodged gloriously, clothed luxuriously, fed sumptously, the very rich glutton of the Gospel, when he compares himself with her, who, delicate, and pure as the lily bending over the snow-drop, adores the heavenly Infant who has come, in that hour, to share her cold and poverty. And so he crouches down in shame and humility on the clay pavement of his refectory, and in a low wailing, broken with sobs, exclaims: "Woe is me! The Mother of my God seated on the ground, and I comfortably placed at table! My infant Saviour poor and destitute, and I enjoying an abundant meal!"

---

* Matt. iv. 4.

Now to the scripture read, this was then a commentary, and it must be allowed a practical one. It said, more plainly than the neatest print of modern fount could convey it, that if Jesus Christ chose poverty and discomfort for Himself and those whom He best loved, He cannot but be pleased with those who, out of dear love of Him, choose a similar state. It goes on to say, that even when we have done our best to copy, the divine original stands far above us, and beyond our reach, and there is room left for humility at seeing our distance. And so the holy St. Francis, one of whose many beautiful actions we have been narrating, as well as many of his companions, had been rich, but had become poor, nay, wretchedly poor, and mortified, and neglectful of self, and all for God's sake. Yes, though in a cavern, clad in a single tunic, girt with a cord, and feeding on the commonest fare, he saw enough to make him weep, in the greater abasement of God made man.

A proud supercilious age will no doubt tell us that St. Francis did not rightly read the Gospel.

Was he wrong, then, in understanding from it, that our Saviour loved and chose poverty? Or was he wrong in believing it good to love and choose what *He* loved and chose? If the meal which we have described is not to be considered as approaching to the character and spirit of the repast enjoyed by the apostolic college, with their divine Head, then we will agree to go elsewhere to look for a parallel. Whither shall we go? To the workhouse, with its inflexible dietary? Or to the hospital, like St. Cross, with its stinted fare? But it is the voluntary imitation of the divine example, in the Church, that we are seeking; and not the compulsory fasts inflicted on others by the State or the Church. Perhaps when churchmen meet in hall—the nearest approach to the monastic refectory—for example, in one of our universities, may be expected the closest adaptation of necessary refection to the evangelical standard. On a fast-day, particularly of the Establishment's appointment, we may hope to see how well it reads the gospel injunctions. Beneath the well-carved, lofty roof-tree, beside the emblazoned oriel, amid the portraits of the great and rich men who have sanctified the hall before then, around tables well furnished—we will say no more—sit the ministers of a dispensation which, if it be of invisible and spiritual goods, neglects not the ponderable and the perceptible. Perhaps after the duties of the hour are over, one of them will wipe his mouth, and proceed to evening lecture in the pulpit, there to assure his hearers that, among the superstitions of popery is that of embracing a life of poverty and abjection, voluntarily suffering privations, subjecting the body by austerity: all which comes of not studying the Scriptures; as neither the example of our Lord, nor the writings of Paul, give the least warranty for such unnatural conduct. And he will instance, as proof, the grovelling Francis, who quite lost sight of his Saviour, by going on the path of poverty.

In the life of St. Gregory the Great, we read that he daily entertained and served at table twelve poor men, in honor of the twelve apostles; and that one day a thirteenth unbidden guest sat with them. "And none of them that were at meat durst ask Him: Who art thou? knowing that it was the Lord."* Now were it to please that same divine Being to visit thus, in visible form, the haunts of men, and seat Himself at table, where most congenial to his meek heart; we are simple enough to believe that He would be more naturally to be expected in that very refectory of St. Francis's *Carceri*, yet existing in that cloven Apennine, near Asisi, where the same poverty and frugality are still practised, than in the midst of a clerical party, in the combination-room of any University college.

It may perhaps be said, that our parallel is unfair. But we are driven to it, by the absence from the "pure and apostolic branch of the Church established in this country" of anything more likely, *à priori*, to bear analogy with our Saviour's repasts among His apostles. And we cannot forbear remarking how, in every Catholic community, the presence of Christ instructing His disciples, at their common table, is imitated by the reading of Scripture during meals; a practice, we believe, confined to our "unscriptural" and "Scripture-hating" Church.

---

* John xxi. 12.

But our main purpose hitherto has been to show how this maligned, but only faithful Spouse, has alone read her Lord's poverty as a practical lesson, has artlessly believed that it was not a chance but a choice, has unaffectedly deemed it a virtue, has found it a key to many otherwise locked-up treasures, a way rugged and steep over Calvary to Thabor. And this poverty of Christ, our Saviour, may be well put at the head of His actions, as ruling, modifying, and coloring them all, from His cradle to His cross.

It is not, of course, our intention, or we might properly say, our presumption, to go over even the principal actions of that life. We will only cull out a few, and we must premise that our selection will not be systematic; only we shall begin with the beginning, and choose classes or groups of actions, in preference to single acts. In the early period of the divine life on earth, we have necessarily to contemplate the influence which it had upon another person, inferior indeed by far, but nearer to Him of whom we speak than any other created being, A Catholic at once understands us to mean His Blessed Mother.

II. Now it has appeared to us, when contemplating the early scenes of the gospel history, that her place has been far from duly considered, with reference to questions controversially agitated. It is true that the Catholic attaches importance to all recorded concerning her in the Gospel; and finds there proofs incontestable of her virtue, her dignity, her privileges, and her influence, or rather power. The Protestant is, on the contrary, prone to depress, to extenuate, to disattach importance from, all that relates to her; nay, he seeks to overlook it all, as merely secondary, casual, and almost dangerous. Now it is surely important, and it can hardly fail to be interesting, to ascertain what place is appointed to her by the Word, and the Spirit, of God, in the twofold economy of faith, and of grace. In the earlier part of gospel history we must look for our answer.

1. We shall, perhaps, a little weary our readers by the course of remarks through which we must beg to lead them. They will contain nothing new, and nothing very brilliant.

It is clear that the historical books of the New Testament present a twofold aspect, as trustworthy, and as inspired, compositions. Their writers used every human industry and pains to record what they believed and knew to be true; and the Divine Spirit superintended, guided, secured from smallest error, and sealed the work which He Himself had suggested to the writer's mind. There were two excellent reasons, among others, for this mode of dealing. First, those books had to go forth and be examined by men who were unbelievers, and before whom their authors came merely as honest, accurate, and credible historians. They were to be received by Pagan and Jew, and later by sceptic and sophist, antecedently to any recognition of their inspiration. They were to be submitted to all the tests of human ingenuity, and even malice; put on the rack; compared with every other sort of document; tried by geography, physics, history, morals; examined by every possible light, heathen, rabbinical, Gnostic, Jewish; tortured philologically in every member of every sentence. Then the character of each writer was to be investigated; when he lived and where; what were his means of knowing; what his right to speak; what his language, his dialect, his idioms, his peculiar turn of thought; what his object and purpose, and what his mode of attaining it; what his interest, his gain, his loss, his chances. In fact, men who were called upon to give up everything that human nature hugs, and evil passions stick to, on the strength of certain most extraordinary facts related by what seemed very ordinary people, were not likely to do so upon a claim of inspiration, but would search into the evidence of the facts, through the credibility of their vouchers, with the sharp scrutiny of a repugnant mind. Now this inquiry must be exercised on the varied elements of a human truth. The earthly author must appear, if not in his infirmities, at least in his peculiarities, to lend a grasp to the eager searcher. Where there are no veins, no grain, no color, no separable ingredients, no penetrable point, investigation is hopeless. Hence every defender of the Gospels, from the beginning of the Church till now, has laid hold of those coincidences with, or approximations to, other writers, which proved humanly the perfect veracity of the inspired penmen; and even minute research has been employed, to discover apparently trifling corroborations of particular statements. Let the reader but look at the first sentence of Dr. Lardner's "Credibility," and he will see how an able Protestant vindicator of the New Testament undertakes what we have described. The same course is pursued by Catholics, enforcing the credibility of the gospel history against unbelievers.*

A second reason for this economy is that of its becomingness. The gift of inspiration could not be supposed to be bestowed on negligent or careless writers. We cannot well imagine a consciousness of inspiration (we do not speak of vision or revelation) in one who had witnessed facts, superseding all care or effort, accurately to remember what he had witnessed. He did his best to render himself worthy of the marvellous gift, by his own thoughtful and diligent application to the task. He wrote as conscientiously, and with as anxious a desire to give the truth, as though he had no guarantee against error.

---

* Every course of theology will show this. *E. g.* Perrone, tom. i. cap. iv. pr. i.; tom. ix. par. ii. sect. i. c. i. pr. iii., where the usual arguments for credibility are brought forward.

The result is, consequently, as we have remarked, a double aspect under which the evangelical records present themselves. First, they will bear the strictest scrutiny as histories, antecedent to all proof of revelation; so as to compel the acknowledgment of the facts contained in them—facts which form the basis of Christianity. And this secures moral certainty to one previously an unbeliever. Secondly, they have on them the sacred and divine stamp of inspiration, of which no sufficient evidence can exist out of the Catholic Church; and this furnishes them with supernatural authority, making them be believed no longer with a human, but with a divine, faith. The one makes them credible, the other infallible; the one true, the other certain.

But the surest proof that the first character pervades the gospel history is, the appeal made by the writers themselves to the usual grounds of credibility. These are of two classes. St. John claims the rights of the first—that of an eye and ear-witness. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of Life (for the Life was manifested, and we have seen, and do bear witness, and declare unto you the Life eternal, which was with the Father, and hath appeared to us); that which we have seen and have heard, we declare unto you."* Again, of the mysterious flow of blood and water from Christ's side: "And he that saw it hath given testimony; and his testimony is true."† And at the close of his gospel: "This is the disciple that giveth testimony of these things, and hath written these things."‡ St. Luke contents himself with being evidence of the second class, as the accurate recorder of events carefully collected from first witnesses. "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand, to set forth in order a narration of the things which have been accomplished among us, according *as they have delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word*; it seemed good to me also, *having diligently attained to all things from the beginning*, to write to thee in order, most excellent Theophilus."§

And, in fact, if we diligently peruse the Gospels, we shall perhaps be surprised to find how few events are recorded, of which the knowledge could not have come from human testimony. The prayer in the garden, which was unwitnessed by man, and the first moments of the resurrection, perhaps form the only exceptions; but they can, and may, be supposed to have been communicated by Him, whose testimony infinitely transcends that of man.

---

* 1 John i. 1. † John xix 33. ‡ John xxi. 24.
§ Luke i. 1–3.

We may seem to have made a long digression, or to have taken a circuitous path to our purpose. It is indeed so. But we have gained these two points: first, that the chain of evidence, whereby the great Christian system is mainly sustained, must be unexceptionable as to strength, decision and completeness, without a flaw or imperfection; and secondly, that the divine inspiration confirms and sanctions the solidity and fitness of every link. Hence arises the high position of evangelist in the order of saints. St. John is styled "the Evangelist," in preference to "the Apostle," because the first title is a distinctive beyond the second. And no small portion of the apostles' glory consists in their having been chosen witnesses of our Blessed Lord's actions, to manifest them to the world; whence St. Paul hesitates not to say, that we are of God's household, because we are "built upon the foundation" (that is, the testimony) "of the apostles and prophets."*

But whatever may have been the importance of the facts or events to which they were called to be witnesses, there was one of more importance than them all, one which is the very ground-work of the Christian dispensation, without the certainty of which the entire system falls to pieces. This is the mystery of the Incarnation, as accomplished upon earth. To this God willed that there should be only one witness; of all its holiest details one sole evidence. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may stand,"* except the Word of words, the Incarnate Word. This must stand attested to the world forever by only one witness,—and that was Mary, the ever blessed. Who could tell that Gabriel came from heaven, and brought her, from the Eternal Father, message? Who, that she was alarmed at his greeting? Who, that she hesitated to accept the proposed prerogative of a divine maternity, at its imagined price? Who, that he manifested the fulness of the gift, and the miraculous agency by which it had to be accomplished? Who, her virginal consent, and its concurrent effect, the Mystery of life, the Emanuel in existence, a God-man in being? Only she, the chosen, exclusive partaker, on earth, of the most hidden counsels of the Almighty.

---

* Ephes. ii. 20.

Now, first, take away her contribution to the gospel testimony, efface her testimony to Christianity, and you find not simply a link broken, but the very fastening of the whole chain wanting; not merely a gap, or a break, made in the structure, but the foundation gone. In the laws of belief on testimony, what elsewhere appears unnatural is true. If you want to make a structure look unsafe, you represent it as a pyramid resting on its point. Yet where the number of believers increases at each generation, from the first source of evidence, it is clear that a diagram representing this fact, and the unity of derivation of the truth believed, would present this very form. Now here the belief in the wonders wrought in the Incarnation, of ages and of the world, rests upon one point of testimony, a unit, a single voice—that of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

---

* Matt. xviii. 16.

Again we say, cancel her testimony, and what becomes of all other witnesses? Had she not let out the secrets of her breast, or, in higher truth, had not God's Spirit moved her, as He moved the Evangelists, not to collect, indeed, but to scatter; not to inquire, but to teach; had He not thus made her the Evangelist of the Evangelists, and the Apostle to Apostles; had not that same divine influence which overcame her first reluctance of purity prevailed over her second unwillingness, from humility (of which we shall treat later), and compelled her to speak; the whole tale of love, which fills the holiest of histories, would have wanted, not only its tenderest and most affecting beginning, but the very root from which its loveliness and beauty spring, to circulate through it all. We should have read with wonder the account of miracles most amazing, and discourses most admirable, and virtues most divine; but it would have been difficult for us to separate, in our minds, this narrative from what we attribute to prophets or patriarchs, had not the clear, and most sweet, and consoling record of our Lord's appearance on earth been preserved for us, so as totally to segregate Him from the very highest orders of holiness, and make Him even here "higher than the heavens." And let it be remarked too, that even the principal circumstances of our Saviour's Nativity and early life rest exclusively upon the same evidence. When St. Luke collected his narrative from those who had been witnesses from the beginning, Joseph was long departed, and so were Zachary and Elizabeth, as well as Simeon and Anna. She only who laid up all that happened in her mother's heart,* survived, witness of the journey to Bethlehem and of the flight into Egypt, of the angelic messages which accompanied these events, and of the presentation in the temple. Who else had retained in memory the words so admirable, and so important to us, of Elizabeth and of Zachary; above all, that canticle of dearest interest to the Church for ever, her unfailing evening hymn, the *Magnificat?* It is a treasury, the mother's bosom, at once capacious and retentive, in which can be secured words and deeds that have passed from every other mind. And so when, after forty years, the early life of our Redeemer is inquired into, there remains one faithful and most loving witness, to give proof of what ennobled, ratified, and stamped with divine evidence, every action and every word of His after-life. Mary alone supplied the testimony to His miraculous conception and birth, and to the fulfilment of the prophecies in her pure virginal being.

But we may go further. So completely had these wonderful occurrences been concealed, so well had "the secret of the King been hidden,"* that when our Lord came before the public, its uncontradicted opinion pronounced Him to be Joseph's son, "being as it was supposed, the son of Joseph."† And the people hesitated not to say in His own very country, "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren James, and Joseph, and Simon, and Jude; and his sisters, are they not all with us?"‡ And again they said, "Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How then, saith he, I came down from heaven?"§ Here were valid elements of human evidence, a strong foundation for historical assertion. Had any one gone into the very country and neighborhood where Jesus had lived, to inquire into His early history, he would have found concurrent testimony that He was "the carpenter's son." The espousals of Mary with him would have been quoted, as well as their enrolment in Augustus' census. Public repute,—that is, the testimony of thousands, might have been powerfully alleged. And against all its authority what have we to oppose? The simple assertion of Mary. So high, so sacred, so undoubted is her word, that to the Christians of all ages it has sufficed to counterbalance every other source of information. Surely, then, her place is the very first in the order of Gospel evidences, and so in the economy of faith.

---

* Luke ii. 19, 51.

---

* Tob xii. 7. † Luke iii. 23. ‡ Matt. xiii. 55.
§ John vi. 42.

Let us again consider what gives her this position. When an apologist, as writers on the evidences are most unbecomingly called, wishes to establish the claims of the evangelists to our credit, antecedent to the proof of inspiration, he justly insists upon what they did and suffered, to demonstrate their sincerity. We are most rightly shown how every interest was surrendered, every dearest affection sacrificed, prospects, comfort, home, friends, family, how every suffering was incurred, every hardship courted, from the discomfort of an uncertain life to the extremity of certain death; and who, it is powerfully asked, would act thus without firm conviction, and on behalf of anything but truth? And further appeal is justly made to the wonders which they themselves wrought, and the supernatural gifts which they displayed, in attestation of their truthfulness. Now all this being most true, let us see how it influences our idea of the character of God's blessed Mother. Long before the three first gospels were written, very long before the last of them was penned, the Apostles had given their testimony to the whole world,—"their sound had gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world."* Some of them had even sealed their doctrine with their blood. And there may have been some who, like Thomas in

---

* Ps. xviii. 5.

India, or Bartholomew in Armenia, never used the written word to teach Christianity. And no doubt each of them spoke as a witness of the Resurrection, and other miracles. But they were just as ready to die for the truth of much which they had not seen,—for the certainty of the virginal conception of Mary, and the marvels of the Nativity. They indeed had divine internal conviction of all these facts; but they preached them to the heathen and Jewish world as witnesses. They would claim therefore the same credit and authority for what they taught on Mary's testimony, as for what they had witnessed with their own eyes. And if any one asked them what motives of credibility they could give for her witnessing, they would indeed necessarily be of a nature totally different from any other. To her were granted no miraculous powers, no supernatural gifts. To her was not accorded the rougher evidence of apostolic trial and suffering. No prison, no rack, no sword, save that of grief, is her appointed lot. How could it have been otherwise? She lives in quiet; she dies in peace. She had everything to *gain* by her testimony; it secured to her the sublime, unrivalled position of God's Mother. What then was the corroboration of *her* testimony, which an apostle would allege? Her spotless innocence, her heroic fortitude, her unfailing sweetness, her peerless holiness; in one word, her matchless virtue. But further, her participation in all the evidences of her Son's mission. Every prophecy which He uttered, every heavenly doctrine which He preached, every miracle which he wrought, every grace which he displayed, was witnessing to her every time He called her His mother. Whatever proved to the world who He was, showed it equally what she was. Every work which demonstrated Him to be the Son of God, proved her irrefragably to be the Mother of God. "Beatus venter qui te portavit, et ubera quæ suxisti,"* was the natural expression of feeling regarding both. It was a contradiction of reason and a blasphemy against God to suppose that she was not worthy of her high dignity, her awful relationship, or rather her appointed office, in the scheme of man's Redemption.

Such was the ground of credibility accorded to her testimony; one superior far to what was given to any of the apostles. Let us then imagine the "glorious choir" of these holy men, about to spread over the whole earth to preach the Gospel, and collecting together the great facts which they must proclaim as the basis of their doctrine, and to which they must bear witness, even by the shedding of their blood. There is as yet no written word of the New Law; and this meeting is therefore the very first source of universal teaching. Each one comes to pour into the common fountain his jealously-guarded store, thence to well forth, and flow unfailingly, as the stream of tradition through the Church—the life-bearing river of the earthly paradise. Some bring less, and some more: while those who have been born after time into the faith, receive almost with jealousy what into their eager ears by the more favored ones is poured. John and his brother and Peter attest the anticipation of celestial glory on Thabor. The first of these alone can recount, while others hang down their heads and blush, what took place on Calvary, and on its rood: and the last bears witness against himself, of his triple denial in the high priest's hall. Nicodemus has a hidden treasure which he brings out, in the mysterious conference that he held with Jesus; and Magdalen may be the only one to tell the history of her forgiveness. But when each one has contributed his all,—miracles, and parables, and gracious words, and wisest discourse, and splendid acts,—they have but furnished materials for a history of three years of a life of three-and-thirty. Where do the remaining thirty lie hidden? Who holds their annals? Who is the rich treasurer of that golden heap, of blessed words and acts divine? One, only one. Let her be entreated to enrich the world by participation of her recondite knowledge. She comes to pour, into the bright waters that flow from the apostolic fount, the virginal cruse which, Queen of wise virgins, she treasures in her bosom. Yea truly, and the lamp which *it* feeds cannot be extinguished. A few drops indeed only will she give: for by those thirty years it may be said that she mainly was intended to profit; they were *her* school of perfection. But every single drop is most precious—is as a peerless and priceless pearl. "Oleum effusum nomen tuum."* The very name of JESUS, that name of blessing and salvation, she makes known as a divine revelation to her, and with it all the promises of what He should, under it, accomplish, and the proclamation of what, by it, He was declared. While apostles surrounded Him to witness His wonderful works, while multitudes pressed in admiration to listen to Him, she hung, at times, on the skirt of the crowd, or stood outside the door, the solicitous, because loving, mother. But the maternal heart naturally flies back to the days of infancy, which are there laid up in vivid recollection. The woman will most gladly remember the hour of her purest joy; when she rejoiced that a man was born into the world.† What, then, if He was the "Wonderful, God the Mighty."‡ And such are the precious and most soothing manifestations which Mary will make, for the comfort of devout souls, even to the end of the world. She will lay the very groundwork of the evangelical narrative. Whatever gratitude the Church bears towards the collectors and preservers of our first sacred records is due in signal manner to her. Whatever of credibility, authority, and truthfulness is warranted by Christian belief, to the witnesses of what constitutes the basis of faith, must be peculiarly extended to her. Nor may we doubt the justness of her title in the Church—Regina Apostolorum.

---

* Luke xi. 27

---

* Cant. i. 2.

† John xvi. 21.

‡ Is. ix. 6.

This our obligation is further enhanced by a consideration to which we have alluded, and which has often struck us in reflecting on a passage in the Gospel. May we be allowed to add that its beauty, as well as its importance, seems to us to have been much overlooked. From Matt. i. 18–24, it is clear that the angel's visit to the Blessed Virgin was by her completely concealed. This would have seemed almost impossible. It was a subject for the purest, yet intensest, joy; for an exultation of spirit that would beam forth from every feature, would quiver on the lips, betray itself by involuntary gestures of bliss. Then to be so exalted, and not show consciousness of it: to be raised above every attainable dignity, to find oneself become the theme of prophecy, the fulfilment of types, the term of the Old Law, the dawn of the new day, the mother of the world's life, in one word, the Mother of God, and not, by look or word, hint it; to be as calm, as simple, as natural, the next time she spoke with Joseph, as if nothing had occurred; this gives us a truer estimate of the beauty and perfection of her character than almost anything else that is on record. And further, that, naturally foreseeing or knowing, as time went on, Joseph's tormenting perplexity, she should have preferred to bear its pain—the most grievous possible to her pure and affectionate heart—to a manifestation of her lofty privileges and heavenly maternity, proves both a humility without parallel, and a confidence in God's providence worthy of it. But now, is it rash to say, that if even such strong motives as were here presented did not suffice to overcome her humble modesty, and induce her to manifest her hidden glory, there must have been a reason stronger still to influence her, when afterwards she gave minute details of Gabriel's interview, and the circumstances of the divine Incarnation? And this will be supplied by the same power which impelled St. John, in extreme old age, to record his remembrances of our Lord's discourses; the Holy Spirit's prompting to a work important for our instruction, and so for our salvation.

And now we may ask, Is there anything exaggerated, unnatural, or repugnant to God's word, in the view which we have taken of the Blessed Virgin's place in the economy of faith? We feel sure there is not. We have then only further to ask, Is this her position one in accordance with Protestant ideas, or Protestant affections? Would it suit the pulpit or the pen of Anglican or Dissenter, Lutheran or Calvinist? Would it be tolerated even as a speculative thesis in a Protestant university, or be proposed as a theme for devout meditation by a high-church director? Take the whole range of heretical feelings towards the Mother of the Incarnate Word, from brutish abhorrence (we blush to write it) to formal indifference, and see where her claims will fit in. But to a Catholic such a position is at once natural and acceptable. He greets with joy whatever tends to enhance her merits, or increase her praise. He recognizes her as a being placed above his power of adequately doing justice to either. It is gratifying, therefore, and consoling to him to learn, even though it may not have struck him before, that the ever holy Virgin Mother of God holds a high, or the highest, place, in any relation which binds her, on the one side, to the merciful counsels of God, and, on the other, to those for whom they are decreed.

2. And now let us proceed to inquire what place those early records of our dear Saviour's life assign to His parent in the order of grace. That she was full of grace when she was chosen by God for that high dignity, we have an angel's word.* That the inpouring of all grace into the already full vessel, by the incarnation itself, made it overflow, who can doubt? We have only to examine what happened, on the first occasion of proof, to satisfy ourselves of this.

There must have been particular reasons, as we have before suggested, for the selection of any given gospel history from the abundance withheld; and, therefore, it is no presumption to believe that one of the most remarkable and profitable events succeeding the incarnation, was the visitation of Mary to Elizabeth. Simply read, it is a touching record. The humble condescension of that now sovereign lady towards her aged relative, in travelling into the mountains to congratulate with her on her miraculous conception, and the lowliness of respect and veneration with which her greeting was received, and the breaking out from Mary's holy lips of her first and last recorded canticle and prophecy, render this meeting remarkable in the eyes of the most superficial reader. Catholic meditation will go deeper than this. Gabriel's was the first salutation of Mary, Elizabeth's the second; and in the Church's both are united and fit together, and are riveted as naturally as we are told the chains of Peter at Jerusalem and at Rome were when brought into contact. "Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb!" This might have been all spoken by one, so well do all its parts cohere. And what wonder? An archangel sent from God, and a matron filled with the Holy Ghost, are but different instruments moved by the same breath, and must sound in perfect harmony. And hence Elizabeth is the second external witness of the incarnation, receiving knowledge of that marvellous mystery from the Spirit of God. What a full and overpowering sense of its grandeur, and of the dignity of Mary, do not her words convey? "Whence is this to me, that the Mother of my Lord should come to me? and blessed art thou who hast believed, because those things shall be accomplished that were spoken to thee by the

---

* Luke i. 28.

Lord."* Suppose, three months before, it had been announced to Elizabeth that her relation Mary had come to see her, would it have appeared to her anything astonishing? She was the elder by many years, and her husband was a priest of high rank: could it have been thought a wonderful favor, an unexpected condescension, that the young maiden, betrothed to a carpenter, and their relation, should come to pay them both a visit? But Zachary, moreover, had been favored by an angel's visit, a rare honor in those days, when the direct word of God had become precious, as in the time of Heli.† And let us observe, as we pass, that the respective positions of Zachary and Joseph, in relation to Elizabeth and Mary, are definitely distinguished by the difference of the two annunciations. In the first, the archangel Gabriel appears, and conveys the tidings of a son to the future father; in the second, he brings his message only to the immediate mother. But to return, Elizabeth, too, had been blest by a miraculous gift, of a child in her old age, of a child pre-described by the greatest of the prophets. In the order of grace, therefore, both had been signally ennobled. How much more sublime must the position of the Blessed Virgin have appeared to them, how much superior her rank, that her coming to them should have been, to their minds, as a royal visit, of which they could not, in any way, consider themselves worthy? Nor must it be forgotten that the expression of these sentiments proceeded not merely from a personal conviction, but from the Holy Spirit, who spake through Elizabeth. The words which she uses are worthy of special note. "Whence is this to me?" In other words, "What have I, or what am I, that such an honor should be conferred upon me? However favored I may have been myself, however honored by God's choice, and God's blessing, the distance between me and thee is so immense that I cannot account for this act of kindness." Then how does she describe it? "That the mother of my Lord should come to me?" She was indeed the mother of the Precursor; Mary, of her, and his, Lord. Her son was to close the Old Testament (for "until John was the law"[*]), Mary's was to give and ratify the New; John was to be the sealer of prophecy, Jesus its fulfilment; John was the herald, Jesus the King. But the words "my Lord" recall to our minds a similar expression, where the two ideas of the Messiahship and the Godhead are united. "The Lord said to *my Lord*," as spoken by David, and explained in this sense by Christ Himself:[†] "*My Lord* and my God," as similarly applied by St. Thomas.[‡] Elizabeth, then, the woman "just before God, walking in all the commandments and justifications of the Lord without blame;"[§] Elizabeth, the mother of the "greatest who was born of woman,"[‖] given to her miraculously; Elizabeth, in fine, the inspired of the Holy Ghost, here assigns to Mary a place immeasurably superior to her own; in virtue of her prerogative as the mother of the incarnate Word, the Saviour of the world, the only begotten of God the Father.

---

* Vv. 43–45.

† 1 Reg. iii. 1.

---

[*] Luke xvi. 16.

[†] Ps. cix. 1; Luke xx. 42.

[‡] John xx. 28.

[§] Luke i. 6.

[‖] Matt. xi. 11

We may pause to ask with whose belief about the Blessed Virgin does this feeling of Elizabeth agree—with that of Catholics or with that of Protestants? The latter, as we are told in a most important work just published,* consider her as "a good woman," perhaps a holy one. But with the exception of a few more ultra high churchmen, none are prepared to exalt her so completely, by right of her prerogative, above every other order of sanctity, even that which the word of God has pronounced "without blame." In the Catholic system, on the contrary, no one will deny that this superiority is not a matter of opinion, but one of universal belief; not a sentiment, but a doctrine. And it is assigned on the same ground as it is by Elizabeth,—the incommunicable privilege of the divine maternity.

But all that we have said goes no further than allotting to the Blessed Virgin the highest place in the order of grace; whereas we have to inquire what is her relation to the economy, or dispensation, of grace. For we have remarked, that the Visitation is a fair test of this. If any Catholic sentiment, respecting her, gives particular offence to the Protestant mind, it is one which forms the basis of confidence in our devotion towards her: that it pleases God to make her the channel of great spiritual graces. In reality, there is nothing very unnatural in the idea, when one considers that it pleased Him to give, through her, to the world, the Grace of graces, the very Fountain of every good gift. While the ordinary laws of nature were so overruled as that she alone should have a part in this god-like work, they were so preserved as that her share should be real and complete. She was the only being ever created, from whom God at any time received or took anything. And it was that humanity thus derived in truth from her* that, united with the divinity, in one person, but two natures, was the ransom of man, and the source of salvation and grace. After this, can it be wonderful, if by the same means are dispensed the fruit of that first and divine Gift? But let us see how it was in the Visitation.

---

* "Jesus and Mary." By the Rev. J. B. Morris. Vol. i. p. 345.

Elizabeth thus addressed our Blessed Lady: "For behold, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in my ears, the infant in my womb leaped for joy."† It has been the unfailing tradition of the Church, attested, with perhaps one exception, by every father, that in that instant the Baptist was cleansed from original sin, and sanctified in his mother's womb.* In fact, it would be repugnant to imagine consciousness of his Redeemer's presence prematurely so granted him, and a joyful recognition of Him made, without this boon. For the very knowledge thus miraculously communicated would imply conviction of sin, whereof He was the Redeemer; and this could only inflict pain, unless accompanied by immediate removal of what estranged one from the other. The joy attendant on the consciousness reveals that this took place.

---

* "Misit Deus Filium suum, *factum ex muliere*."—Gal. iv. 4.

† Luke i. 44.

St. John was thus purged and hallowed in the womb; this was a fruit of redemption, and, in fact, its essential result. To purchase for us forgiveness of sin, to reverse the original curse, and make us once more children of God, and heirs of His kingdom, were the great objects which brought down the Word from the bosom of His Father. Not only was this purification of John, before birth, a fruit of Redemption, but it may be well considered the first act of our Saviour's life, in application of His atonement. It was indeed meet that His very first recorded action, being yet unborn, should be the forgiveness of a sinner. It was no less becoming that this first deed of mercy and grace—the forerunner of so many similar ones should be performed in favor of the Precursor; the theme of whose preaching, the burden of whose prophetic song may well be supposed to have been taught him now: "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world!"

---

* See the proofs collected in the work referred to, "Jesus the Son of Mary," vol. i. p. 378.

Now through whose instrumentality was this first act of graciousness performed, this first application of the fruits of redemption made? There was nothing to prevent its taking place silently. Jeremias was not made aware till his mission commenced that he had received consecration before birth.* But in this instance, God was pleased to employ an outward agency, and we are told what it was. It was the voice, the word of His mother. As soon as the voice of her salutation sounded in Elizabeth's ears, so soon, and no sooner does the act of mercy take place. Had that salutation been anticipated or delayed by her will, the prophet's liberation would have come sooner or later. Her word of greeting was the sentence of his forgiveness. The pardon was our Lord's alone, the grace His, the love His; but the conveyance of them all was left to her; she transmitted pardon, grace, and love to the exulting prisoner.

This gives us then the place assigned, by the early records of our Lord's life, to His most blessed Mother, in the economy of grace. It makes her the dispenser of the very first grace which He bestowed after His incarnation; a grace of most sublime order, in favor of his dearest saint, the friend of the bridegroom. Now let us take, in conjunction with this remarkable fact, another, and a parallel one. We mean the performance of Christ's first miracle at Cana. From St. John's account it is evident that our Lord performed it in obedience to His Mother, and even anticipated His appointed hour for her sake: "My hour is not yet come." Heedless of this protest, she feels confident that He will grant her request, and orders the servants to make preparations for the miracle.* Again we have the same principle acted upon. The first temporal grace, though it required a miracle, and that miracle involved departure from a predetermined plan, was for her, at her request, through her means. The wine would never have been obtained, had she not interposed.

---

* Jer. i. 5.

We may, perhaps, discover in all this a further relation between Mary and the dispensation of grace. The Baptist's sanctification was *his* mystical baptism, an anticipation, by special favor to him, of what other souls were to receive through the ordinance which he had to announce—the baptism of water and the Holy Ghost. The transmutation at Cana was the symbol, and the illustration, of a more wonderful change, in the Eucharistic wedding-feast. Each of these preliminary and preparatory demonstrations of power was made through the instrumentality of the Blessed Mary. Is this surprising? She was the *aurora consurgens*, the beautiful dawn of the glorious Sun of salvation. And does not the morning's brightness transmit to earth the first rays, the light, the warmth, the color, the glow, the radiance of the great Orb, before he shows himself? Do not all these cheering qualities and appearances belong to him, yet do they not reach us even before himself, through a medium through which he diffuses them? Then let us not wonder (what Catholic *can* wonder?) that she in whom, and by whom, the Son of God would have himself brought into the world, as she came before Him to announce Him, should also have gone before Him to make known, and anticipate in symbols of incomparable beauty, the two great sacraments by which Redemption would bear the fruits of adoption in the world.

---

* John. ii. 4, 5.

Our divine Master's actions, as we have before now remarked, were never purposeless. They give us principles and analogies which cannot deceive us. His first action especially, in a given case, may be supposed to lay down a rule. Thus we are told how He called His first disciples —Peter and Andrew, the sons of Zebedee, and Matthew. It was by a command to leave all and follow Him. We do not doubt, though not informed of it, that every other apostle was called on the same terms. We find how He treated Magdalen, and the woman accused before Him; and nothing would induce us to believe that He ever showed Himself austere or unforgiving. Nay, one action of our Lord suffices to give a certain Law. For instance, could we doubt, after seeing His conduct at Cana that had His blessed mother, at any subsequent period of His life, asked Him for any other similar favor, or exercise of power, He would have refused it? The common sense of analogy forbids us to think so, with an *a fortiori* power; for it would have been much less to ask for a miracle when thousands were being performed, than to ask and obtain a first, and, in some sense a premature, one.

Again, this argument of analogy, or precedent, carries the Church always beyond this life. It is not necessary to enter upon any elaborate reasoning on this subject, but we may illustrate it by one or two examples. We assign to the apostles their place in the celestial court, by that which they occupied, in relation to our Saviour, on earth. We do not compare their actions with those of others, and award relative merit accordingly. We do not consider whether St. Francis Xavier, or St. Boniface, may not have labored more, or converted more to Christianity, than St. James, whom Herod slew, so early as the year 42.* We do not even give them rank by reason of their martyrdom; for St. John, who was not allowed to lay down his life for Christ, holds his preëminence as an apostle far above all martyrs; nor would it make any difference in the place of any apostle, could it be proved that he did not die for the faith. Why this? Because our Lord, by His mere choice of the twelve to be His companions, and by the high commission and the powers which He bestowed on them, assigned them a position above every other class of saints, and this we believe to be continued to them in heaven. Again, Magdalen and Martha were sisters. The second preserved to the end of life an unblemished character, and is honored by the Church among her holy virgins. She follows the Lamb in heaven whithersoever He goeth. Her sister has not this privilege; she is a saint only as a penitent. Yet the Church bestows upon Magdalen her higher honors, and gives to Martha an inferior reverence.* Wherefore the difference? Simply because on earth our Redeemer, by His conduct, gave her this rule. It was clear that He granted precedence to the ardent penitent, whose love and tears had blotted out every trace of guilt, before her more faultless, but less fervent, sister. It was really the parable of the Prodigal in action; the blameless son who had never left home, saw the best garment prepared, and the fatted calf killed, for his wandering, but rescued brother.

---

* Acts xii. 2.

If, then, there be truth in all the foregoing remarks, we come to the following conclusions: That, firstly, it pleased our Saviour to make His dear Mother His instrument in the first conveyance of the highest grace, and of the first-fruit of redemption, after He came on earth; secondly, and similarly, He made her the first cause and motive in the exercise of His beneficial miraculous powers, in favor of men; thirdly, His conduct being always a principle or rule, we may deduce that, on other similar occasions, He would have allowed her a similar privilege or right, and, fourthly, this argument of analogy does not end with His life, but gives the Church a just ground of belief and action, after both He and His Mother have been reunited in heaven. So far, then, from there being any strangeness, or impropriety, in considering the Blessed Virgin to be an ordinary channel of grace, and that of the highest order, such a view of her position seems borne out by our Lord's conduct, interpreted by the usual rules which we apply to it. This reasoning places our Blessed Lady, in the economy of grace, in the same position which we have seen her occupy in the economy of faith. She stands immediately next to her divine Son, above every other created being.

---

* The Feast of St. Mary Magdalen is a double, that of St. Martha only a semi-double. To the first is also accorded the Nicene Creed in the Mass; which is not read in that of any other female saint except the Blessed Virgin.

For if we compare her power even with that of the apostles, we shall find it of a different, and a superior, character. They had in all fulness a double gift; the sacramental energy in its completest development, and a miraculous command over nature and its laws. The first was surely not comparable to the conveying directly saving virtue, from the Son of God in her womb, to the Precursor in Elizabeth's; thereby not only cleansing him from original sin, but probably arming him with immunity against actual transgression, sanctifying him for his high calling and spotless life.

And who will surmise that it was a higher gift to hold the delegated power of working miracles from her Son, than to have obedience owned by Him who communicated it, and to possess the acknowledged subjection of Himself and all His gifts? The meaning of the words, "Et erat subditus eis,"* came out to its full extent, in the act which closed the hidden life of Jesus, the miracle of Cana.

III. When we advance into the active life of the Word incarnate, every action speaks; and our difficulty is, out of so much that is admirable, what to choose as most excelling. We will take, therefore, as an illustration of our principles, a series of actions which, separately, may appear indifferent, but collectively afford a meaning too striking to be accidental, and yet only fitting into the Catholic system.

Our Lord selected his principal apostles from among the fishermen of the Sea of Galilee. The particular call of four is especially described, of the brothers Peter and Andrew,† and the two sons of Zebedee.‡ Thomas also and Nathanael, supposed to be the same as Bartholomew, were of the same profession.§ The reasons for this selection do not enter into our present subject; though they are not without their interest and importance. But the choice once made, it is evident that our Saviour associated Himself to His apostles in their mode of life, and made use of it for His holiest purposes. A great part of the first year of His public life was passed on the borders of the Sea of Tiberias or Galilee; and He took advantage of His apostles' skill, and familiarity with the coast, to move from place to place. The fourth, fifth, sixth, and eighth chapters of St. Mark will show how the fishermen's boat was almost His home.* It was His place of sleep,† the pulpit from which He addressed the people,‡ His refuge in fatigue.§ Now, connected with this frequent use of the boat are several remarkable passages of His life, which, apart from their miraculous character, present importantly instructive features. Indeed it may not be superfluous to remark that in some of our Blessed Redeemer's acts the miracle may be considered as secondary: that is, we may contemplate the action independently of any miracle which accompanied it, and find that what was wonderful was only subservient to a lesson, inculcated by the action itself. Perhaps the instances on which we are going to dilate will afford the best illustration of this principle.

---

* "And He was subject to them."

† Matt. iv. 18.

‡ Ib. 21.

§ John xxi. 2.

That our Saviour Himself saw, and consequently designed, an analogy between the apostle's and the fisherman's occupation, He Himself has deigned to inform us: "I will make you fishers of men;"‖ or, "from henceforth thou shalt catch men,"¶ were His words, naturally suggestive of the parallel. But besides this very natural analogy, there were surely others, which must be considered most apt, in another view. What more like the Church, launched on the sea of this world, and, freighted with a heavenly burden, borne forward towards a sure harbor, than the vessel laden with apostles, and bearing their Lord, lashed by the angry billows, and buffeted by the raging blast, tossed, shaken, distressed, almost broken, yet holding on her good course, and riding fearless over the wave, and through the storm? So natural is this comparison that it has ceased to be one. The "nave," or "ship," of the material church is no longer so in simile; and it is scarcely an allegory to describe the visible, yet spiritual, Church, as a ship in which Christ is pilot, or, as the Catholic would call it, as "the bark of Peter." From the rude galley carved on the oldest monumental slabs in the catacombs, to Giotto's mosaic over the inner gate of St. Peter's, or Raffaele's miraculous draught of fishes, the symbol has been continued, till a very child in the Church can comprehend it.

---

* Mark iv. 35; v. 2, 18, 21; vi. 32, 54; viii. 10-14.

† Ib. iv. 38.

‡ Luke v. 3.

§ Mark vi. 32.

‖ Matt. iv. 19.

¶ Luke v. 10.

But wherefore *Peter's* boat? This it is that we must see. If our blessed Saviour was pleased to retire into a vessel, and travel by it, it was not a chance one picked up on the shore, but one especially chosen by Himself to attend Him. "And He spoke to His disciples, that a small ship should wait upon Him, because of the multitude, lest they should throng Him."* What bark was this, so privileged, and so ennobled, scene too of such wonderful works? "They that go down to the sea in ships, doing business on the great waters; these have seen the works of the Lord, and His wonders in the deep. He said the word, and there arose a storm of wind, and the waves thereof were lifted up. They were troubled, and reeled like a drunken man, and all their wisdom was swallowed up. And they cried to the Lord in their affliction, and He brought them out of their distresses. And He turned the storm into a breeze, and its waves were still. And they rejoiced because they were still; and He brought them to the haven which they wished for."* All this was more literally fulfilled in the fisherman's skiff on Galilee's blue waters, than ever it was in the proud merchantman on its ocean path to Ophir.

---

* Mark iii. 9

There were two boats ever keeping company on that inland sea, and they are so mentioned together that we can have no difficulty in determining to whom they belonged. When our Lord began to call His apostles, the two vessels were close to one another; He went but a few steps from Peter's to find that of Zebedee and his sons.† At another time going to the lake, He "saw two ships standing by it, and going up into one of the ships that was Simon's He desired him to draw back a little from the land, and sitting, He taught the multitudes out of the ship." The other ship was Zebedee's. For having given Simon a miraculous draught of fishes, "they beckoned *to their partners, that were in the other ship*, that they should come and help them." Simon then "fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord. For he was wholly astonished, and all that were with him, at the draught of fishes which they had taken. And so also were James and John, the sons of Zebedee, *who were Simon's partners.* And Jesus said to Simon, Fear not, from henceforward thou shalt catch men."*

---

* Ps. cvi. 23.

† Matt. iv. 18-21.

This remarkable passage leaves us no doubt on several interesting points. Two fishing-boats keep company on the Sea of Galilee. They are consorts, fishing in company; *paranze*, as they are still called on the Mediterranean. One belongs to Peter, the other to the zealous and loving brothers, the "Sons of thunder." But we are carefully told that Jesus selected the first. Such a detail was surely of no great consequence in itself; and if specified must be so emphatically. It was Simon's boat that our Redeemer chose. Of what interest was this to Theophilus, or to the Greeks, for whom St. Luke wrote, if Peter was no more than any other apostle? Surely the mention of such a circumstance implies, that it was not by accident, but by choice, that his bark was taken for His use by our Lord. And for what purpose?

First, to teach from. This favored boat is the one from which the Divine Master instructs the multitudes.

---

* Luke v. 2–10.

Secondly, to bestow on Peter the earnest of his future success, as the apostle of Jew and of Gentile. It is impossible to misunderstand the meaning of the allegory performed, not merely spoken. Our heavenly Lord has Himself explained it: "From henceforward thou shalt catch men, as plentifully and as marvellously as, just now, thou hast caught fishes. Thou shalt cast thy net into the vast and dark depths of the spiritual ocean, and thou shalt draw up in them safe, and lay up in thy bark, thousands who shall bless the hour of thy capture." Nor is it possible to mistake the relative position of the parties in the scene. Peter is the chief, the actor; James and John are but his assistants and subordinates in the work. He begins it, they follow it up; he receives the Lord's gift, the blessing, the miracle; they partake of his fulness, and are enriched from his store. His stock is superabundant, his measure well shaken and running over; and they come to share it, almost to relieve him of it, as it runs over into their bosoms. And hence it is carefully added, that to Simon were Christ's words of promise exclusively addressed.

Here we have a case where the miracle is absorbed in the action. The lesson is to us more important; for the miracle is only wrought as a means to convey it. But we have another miracle perfectly analogous to this, wrought at a very different period of our Lord's earthly existence; after His resurrection. Between the two, Peter had given proof of his frailty, even of his dastardliness. John at the same time had shown himself faithful, even to the Cross. Peter, however, in company with him, his brother, and other disciples, expressed his intention of going a fishing. "They say to him, We come also with thee." Peter therefore is again at the head of the party, he is the captain of "the ship;" the rest are his mates and assistants, in other words, his crew. They toil for the night in vain; at morning, Jesus, unrecognized by them, stands on the beach, and bids them cast their net on the right side of the vessel. Their obedience is rewarded by a magnificent draught; and Peter throws himself into the sea, to reach his Master, whom John has detected. Once more it is in favor of Peter's boat and net, that the sea is compelled to give up its prey; and what makes the occurrence more personal and pointed is, that it is immediately followed by his Lord's charge to feed His sheep and lambs.* Here was the distinct fulfilment of the promise made after the first miraculous draught. Simon's humility was there rewarded by an assurance of future apostleship; Peter's penitent love is here crowned by elevation to its headship. On the first occasion, his virtuous timidity prompted him to throw himself on his knees, and entreat his Lord to depart from him a sinner: on the second his penitential ardor urged him to dash into the sea, and go straight to his forgiving Master. Thus completely is the fishing of Peter's boat, after the resurrection, the counterpart of the same action before the denial.

---

* John xxi. 2-17.

Jesus then taught in Peter's ship, and gave to it the power of gathering into its nets the multitude of the deep. But it was not always to be a calm with it; storms were to assail it, even in spite of His benign presence; storms so fierce that they who manned it were to fear that He had forgotten them, or had forgotten His power. "And behold a great tempest arose in the sea, so that the boat was covered with waves; but He was asleep." But He soon awoke at their call; and reproving them for their want of faith, He commanded the winds and the sea, and there came a great calm."* Again we may ask, whose ship was this, to which this divine favor was accorded, of stilling the storm and smoothing the sea? It is not difficult to ascertain it. We are told that, "when Jesus was come into Peter's house, He saw his wife's mother lying, and sick of a fever; and He touched her hand, and the fever left her, and she arose and ministered to them." At evening multitudes come to be healed; "and Jesus, seeing great multitudes about Him, gave orders to pass the water, and when He entered into the boat, His disciples followed Him."† It is from Peter's house that He steps into the vessel; who can doubt that it was that apostle's? And we may observe, that our Lord acts as a master of the boat. He commands its services, as He afterwards did that of the ass for His entry into Jerusalem. "Tell him that the Lord hath need of it, and he will let it go."* To Peter's boat is granted this further privilege, that storms may be permitted to assail it, but not to wreck it, nor even to shatter it. The waves may dash over it, and threaten to engulf it; all may think it is about to perish, and Jesus may appear asleep, and heedless of their danger. But in good time, He wakens up and his beaming eye is as the sun upon the billows, and His hand waves a charm against the blast; and the rippling waters dance, rejoice and sparkle in the light, and the soothing breeze glides playfully into the sail.

---

* Matt. viii. 24.

† Ib. 14–23.

If the bark represent the Church of God, where *is* His Church? What is there that assumes the name that has ever weathered a real storm, or rather that lives in the midst of tempests, with consciousness of a life that cannot fail, and of a vigor that cannot abate? Is it the stationary religion of the East, for ages water-logged and motionless, in waters dead and pestilent; neither battling with them, nor assailed by them, left in unrippling, but fatal, calm; originally too well framed to fall to pieces, but stripped of mast and sail, and rolling heavily with the dull swell and fall of the element in which it happens to be imbedded? For it has itself—

---

* Matt. xxi. 3.

> "Nor breath nor motion;
> As idle as a painted ship,
> Upon a painted ocean."*

Unhonored by persecution, not bearing even the note of the world's hatred, the Christianity of Asia feeds its languid life upon paynim toleration, without an aspiration of hope, or an effort of charity. It sends no missionary to distant regions to pluck the palm of martyrdom; it gives to the world no Sisters of Mercy, no Brothers of Christian Doctrine, no active clergy, no learned hierarchs, no studious monks, no zealous laity. It dreams on from age to age, achieving nothing great, and yielding nothing good; adding nothing to the knowledge or experience of the past, and opening no bright destiny to the prospect of the future. It is not worth a storm, the lazy, slumbering craft. Neither has it a net to cast abroad, or to draw home. It is quite clear *this* is not Peter's boat.

Then what shall we say of a more splendid and well-laden vessel nearer home, which calls itself modestly a branch only of Christ's Church? Surely there is some stir, if not activity, about it; internal commotion, if not onward progress. Every modern improvement is there, to hide defects, or to mend imperfections: all is trim, neat, and respectable, as on any other vessel belonging to the state. And it is splendidly manned, with skillful officers and a zealous crew, whose whole interest is in its prosperity. Abundance and comfort are provided for all on board. But it keeps carefully under the shelter of a safe shore; it tempts not the storm, it shuns the perils of the deep. Its sails and masts are not made for rude conflict with the wind and wave, it loves the smoother waters of vicinity to earth.

---

* Coleridge

> “ Nil pictis timidus navita puppibus
> Fidit : tu, nisi ventis
> Debes ludibrium, cave.”*

It has not the fisherman’s blessing; it draws into its own compass nothing from without; it sends out quietly and decently, as a genteel angler might, not as depending on it, its well-ordered tackle; but it pretends not even to gain by it increase. Yet of conflict and clamor it has enough. Within all is dissension, contention, strife. It is no wonder that it does not move. If its chief commander set the sails in one direction, his mate will trim them oppositely on another mast. If one rows forward, the other strikes backward. And, still more strange, there are those who applaud, and think their bark is going bravely on, because one out of twenty engaged in its direction pulls alone against the rest. This surely was no more than the other, the ship to which it was said, “ Duc in altum,” go out into deep waters, and there face the billows, and throw into them the apostolic net. It is none of Peter’s boats.

And, moreover, these and others have one complete disqualification; they profess *not* to be

---

* Horace.

Peter's bark. They repudiate the connection; they are indignant at being supposed to have anything special to say to him. They have made their choice of another ship, or of many smaller craft, but they will take particular care that it be not his. Anything but that. Now, St. Mark tells us, that when our blessed Lord went into the ship where He slept during the storm, "there were other ships with Him,"* that is, keeping in His wake. What became of them during the tempest? We hear no more of them. Only one ship had Jesus on board, and only of it is the Gospel narrative. They may have put back to harbor, they may have been dispersed in the darkness, some may have been cast on shore; but we read of only one that reached its destination, because only one bore the sure Pilot and the Queller of the storm; and that was Peter's.

But there remains one more instance, in what we may term the sea-faring part of our Saviour's mission, of its connection with St. Peter's prerogatives. We allude to the miracle of our Lord's walking on the waters, related succinctly by St. John,† and more fully by St. Matthew.‡ In the storm above described, Jesus was in the boat sleeping; here He was absent, but near. In the midst of the tempest He appears walking on the waters. The apostles are terrified, and their Divine Master reassures them. There is one of them bolder than the rest. As afterwards he casts himself into the sea to swim to his Lord, so now Peter claims the desperate evidence of walking to Him on the waters. It was a test worthy of himself; ever ardent, ever eager. "Lord, if it be Thou, bid me Come to Thee upon the waters. And He said, Come. And Peter going down out of the boat walked upon the waters, to come to Jesus." It was important, nevertheless, that he should be informed of the danger into which his ardent temperament would lead him. As later he would protest his readiness to die rather than deny his Lord, and yet would fail; so here it was expedient to show him of how little avail would be his own strength, where supernatural support was needed. For, "seeing the wind strong, he was afraid; and when he began to sink, he cried out, saying: Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus stretching forth His hand took hold of him, and said to him: O thou of little faith, why didst thou doubt? And when they were come up into the boat, the wind ceased." Now here are several remarkable circumstances. Peter alone claims the right of walking upon the billows. It is not the ship that must support *him*; it is not because he is in it that he does not perish. He has a power independent of it, so to speak, which no other apostle has. The right hand of Jesus is directly his support when, fearless and alone, he commits himself to the troubled waters. To doubt that, so supported, he has this marvellous prerogative, is to be of little faith. He is allowed partially to sink, that this reproof may be administered to him; and, through him, to us. And then,

---

* Mark iv. 36. † John vi. 19. ‡ Matt xiv. 26.

"when *they* came up into boat, the wind ceased." For they go together, hand in hand, Jesus and Peter, the Head sublime, invisible, and divine, and the Head inferior, visible, and earthly, of the Church—the hand of one is power, the other's is confidence; thus linked they give security. Both ascend the ship together, from which they seemed to have withdrawn their care, Master and Pilot; and to their joint presence is attributed the calm. Can any one believe that there was no connection between our Saviour's act and Peter's? That the one was not performed for the sake of the other? Did Jesus defer accompanying His disciples, and follow them walking on the waters, or, instead of thus passing over the narrow sea, go on board their boat half-way across, only to astonish them? Is all that relates to Peter merely secondary? On the contrary, no one can read this passage and doubt that the whole narrative is inserted mainly for the sake of the apostle's share in it. It is clearly the *lesson* of the history.

Now let us come to our practical conclusion from all that we have here put together.

1. It is evident that our Saviour, during His mission in Galilee, wished, or rather ordered, that a boat should attend Him, from which He preached, and in which He sailed. And though His beloved disciple had one at His disposal, He gave preference to that of Peter.

2. Three classes of miracles are recorded, as taking place in connection with the boat and its occu-

pation: two miraculous draughts of fishes, two quellings of storms, and our Lord and Peter walking on the water.

3. Every one of these is wrought in favor of this apostle, or his bark; and the discourses preceding or following them relate to him.

In the first draught of fishes, as we have seen, he is ordered to go into the deep and cast his net; and after his successful obedience, the promise is made to him that he shall take men. In other words, our Saviour shows that the material action was symbolical of a spiritual one; and the miracle wrought was a proof or guarantee of the truth of the promise. It was as though our Lord had said: "In the same wonderful manner, by the same power, to the same extent, and as surely as you have this day taken such an unwonted netful of fishes, you shall in due time haul from the depths of sin, misery, and ignorance, the souls of men." In the second, it is Peter who has led forth the apostles to their work, and again a miraculous capture rewards him, upon obeying the same command. So completely was it his, that when "Jesus saith to them, Bring hither of the fishes which you have now caught, Simon Peter went up, and drew the net to land;"* a net which, through overladen, was not allowed to break. The other apostles had brought the net to the shore, but it required the presence of Peter to draw it upon land. And in what did this miracle end? In nothing but the fulfilment of the assurance given him after the earlier corresponding miracle. Our Lord here met His disciples, apparently for only one purpose, —to invest Peter, before them, with the dignity of Supreme Pastor. The only discourse that follows is the thrice-repeated commission to feed the flock; and, as if to show that all was then ended, Jesus leads His now inducted Vicar away from the rest for confidential discourse, by adding, "Follow me." So individual was this call, that when Peter would have had his and Christ's loved one to join him, he was checked and refused by the words: "What is it to thee? follow thou me."* It seems impossible to reject the analogy between the two passages, and not to consider one as the complement of the other. In both, Peter is the distinct end of the miracle, both wrought in his favor and introductory to his privileges.

---

* John xxi. 10.

In the two cases of stilling the storm, the same connection with the Prince of the Apostles is to be found. In his boat our Lord appears to slumber, and awakes to reproach His followers generally for want of faith or confidence in Him, and for fear that the vessel could founder, in which He was pleased to abide. In the second instance He seems to them to be further off, to be out of the ship, and the storm goes on till He and Peter have shown themselves on board. Finally, not to repeat what has been so lately described, Peter is taught to tread fearlessly the waters alone; and is reproved, in particular, for want of confidence in his powers to do so, in the very words addressed to all the apostles in the first storm. As though it were said to him: "If the others showed weakness in doubting of their safety in the boat, thou dost the same in hesitating about thy security independent of it. Besides the assuring presence of Jesus in the ship, thou hast His right hand supporting thee in personal safety over the abyss. This can no more swallow up thee, than it." And this assurance is confirmed to him by the miracle.

---

* John xxi. 22.

We certainly do not mean to deny that our Lord may, in the course of His Galilean mission have entered other barks besides Peter's. But this we claim as proved, that the Holy Spirit has been pleased to select, for our special instruction, out of no matter how many, those occurrences in which St. Peter is specially concerned. A Protestant will say: This is merely accidental and secondary; what matters it if the boat were his, or anybody's else, the miracles and lessons were independent of this consideration. Now, a Catholic has too much reverence to treat inspired writings so. With us there is no chance, no accident in what God does or says. We cannot consider it a mere result of blind chance, that every evangelist should have given us narratives of our Lord's "going down to the sea in ships," and yet have, in every specific instance, been careful to let us know that Peter's was the chosen bark. Moreover, we cannot consider it accidental, that every single miracle wrought on board, should have been connected with him. If it was matter of indifference whose the boat was which Jesus took, if no lesson depended on it, why are we distinctly told that there were two boats, and that he selected one, which was Simon's?

All this is unimportant to a Protestant, because it bears on nothing in his system. When even he may be disposed to allow that the ship tossed by the storm was an emblem of the Church, and Jesus subduing the war of elements no unfit symbol of His ruling presence in her, he will not see any connection with the destinies of the vessel in the presence of Peter. He gives no definite meaning to those clear and most dogmatic passages in which supremacy is bestowed on him. And so all the beauty and interest of a minute application of each detail, which we have drawn, perhaps tediously, forth is lost upon him.

But the Catholic has begun by taking in their literal force those passages in which Peter is as closely bound with the constitution of the Church, as the foundation is with a building. The safety of one is the security of the other. He becomes an essential, not an accidental part; a primary, not a secondary element in its formation. The Church of Peter is also the Church of Christ, because the fold of Christ is likewise the fold of Peter. These principles laid down in obedience to other positive teachings of Christ, all the narratives which we have analyzed have a consistent meaning, as well as a definite object. They not only cohere most admirably, but they complete and illustrate most beautifully the constitution of the Church.

According to this view, the Church is but one: for though there may be other, and stately-looking ships launched upon the ocean, there is necessarily only one in which Jesus is pleased to abide; and that is Peter's. To it alone is given assurance of safety, whatever storms may assail it; for in it alone is He whom winds and waves obey. All are safe who are embarked in it, none who are without it. To it alone is committed the work, not only of mastering, but still more of gaining, the world. It is not a rich argosy laden with treasure, nor a lofty galley rowed by captives, nor a fierce war-ship, bristling with instruments of destruction, but a fisherman's craft intent on filling itself with living spoil, snatched from the gulf of destruction. Now, when the Catholic reads all this, described in allegory by our Saviour's actions on the sea, and notes how exactly it fits his theory of the Church, whereof Peter is the head, his faith is strengthened and his heart consoled. For he discovers a purpose in every detail, in every word; and sees that each has been registered for his sake. These lesser coincidences serve to confirm a belief based upon direct teaching; they fill up the picture, they add to it color and life. If the Catholic view is right, and if Peter was meant to occupy in the Church of Christ the place which it assigns him, then every smallest particle of these narratives has its significance, and was studiously recorded for an important purpose. Remove him from it, and there is no intended meaning in the details of their histories; or rather, we reverently say it, they are calculated to confirm, what the Protestant must consider, an erroneous system.

And not only is the Catholic strengthened in his dogmatic convictions by these corroborative and supplementary arguments, but he derives from them most comforting assurances. It is no fancy-picture that comes before him, when he thinks of the tempest-tossed fisherman's bark. He looks at its trials and its triumphs through the very mist of ages. Afar, as if leaving the distant coast, its first harbor, he beholds it steering straight for the very port of the earth's capital in serenest confidence. It is not long before the gates of hell let forth a blast more fearful than Æolus could command from his cavern of storms. The abyss is upheaved, and the might of earth sweeps over it, to destroy the daring invader.

> "Ponto nox incubat atra.
> Intonuere poli, et crebris micat ignibus æther:
> Præsentemque viris intentant omnia mortem." *Æneid* i.

But death from such a tempest has charms for the valiant crew. On, the fearless little bark holds its course; now it is almost lost to sight in the war of persecuting elements, now it crests nobly the topmost wave, till we find it safe riding in smooth water. Peter has been acknowledged the spiritual conqueror of Rome. Yet he must not rest. After the resurrection he said, "I go a fishing," and this is his occupation and his delight till the end of time. What a glorious employment it has been to him! How his heart rejoiced much more than on taking a hundred and fifty-three large fishes, when Patrick drew in his net on Erin's coast, or Augustin on England's, or Boniface in Germany's deep streams, and brought into the ample ship their willing inhabitants! Nor was this calm and peaceful pastime for him. High in the regions of the north commenced a swelling surge, which broke, in successive waves, over the toiling bark. Hun, Vandal, Goth, and Lombard, in rapid course, followed each other, and seemed to overwhelm it in their turn. And still the fisherman went on; while his tempest-tight skiff shook off the cataract of waters, he plied his net in its very depths, and carried from them their living prey. And now again came the calm, and the ocean seemed still. But soon the storm began again. The rude assault of a rough, indocile age, of the world of an iron chivalry, broke loose, again and again, against the charmed ship of Peter. For centuries the conflict lasted, and the gallant vessel held on its course, dashing the spray from its prow. Then came a trial forgotten for ages—since Arius and Nestorius divided the Church. Mutiny on board, insubordination, rebellion. Treacherous crews, from its own decks, man a hostile fleet; its own skill and prowess, learnt within it, are turned against it. Able foes, armed with all the powers of earth, threaten her destruction, and swear implacable hatred. And still the noble vessel fears them not, but goes undaunted on her errand. She sees them tossed to and fro by every wind, sailing apart, without compass to guide them, quarrelling with one another, and only combined when they agree to assail her, and she notes how they have not been able to bear away with them the grace of her noblest functions; no shred of the apostolic net has been allowed to be filched from her. She alone bears aloft the Cross as her banner; she alone boasts that Peter, in his successor, sits at her helm; nay, she alone dares proclaim that she has Jesus Christ Himself on board, as He was on the fisherman's craft on the sea of Galilee. Such is the Catholic's review of the past, and in it he reads the assurance of the future. When, a year ago, this country was agitated from end to end, in opposition to Catholic progress; when the Government, the Parliament, the Establishment, the Press, the aristocracy, seemed combined to thwart the purely ecclesiastical action of the Church; when all that clamor, eloquence, insolence, and calumny, addresses, speeches, meetings, essays, and journalism could do to raise a storm, was unsparingly and perseveringly continued for months, to overwhelm the new hierarchy; in what did we place our hopes, nay, our assurance, that peace would return, and the Church would be justified, by results, in the wise measure which she had taken? Not merely in the knowledge that such a step had been long and wisely considered; not in the high estimate which we had formed of the virtues and gifts of the Supreme Pastor from whom it proceeded. But knowing that the Letters Apostolic which he issued were given under "the Fisherman's Ring," we could not be of little faith, or doubt that what was thus declared to be the solemn act of Peter partook in the promises made to him, and the assurances given, that his bark should not be crushed by the tempests of earth. And so, when Pontiff after Pontiff, like the sixth, seventh, or the ninth Pius, seemed borne apart from the vessel which he guided, to experience, in his own person, the whole violence of the storm, and walk alone over the troubled and treacherous waters, never did the Catholic doubt that the powerful right hand, in which the Psalmist trusted, and which was stretched forth to Peter, would support them and guide them, and bring them safe back, if necessary, to the faithful friends from whom, in body, they had been torn. "Etenim illuc manus Tua deducet me, et tenebit me dextera Tua."

IV. We will now briefly bring together a few passages which refer to a point of secondary importance, but not devoid of interest. Among the puzzling inconsistencies of Protestantism is its Sabbatarian theory. After protesting, in every possible way, against tradition and Church authority, the Protestant accepts, without a murmur, the change of the Jewish Sabbath into the Christian Sunday, of which the only voucher is tradition, and the only foundation ecclesiastical authority. Having thus admitted perhaps the greatest stretch of this power and of that testimony that exists, he begins to forget that any change has been made, and applies to the new day of rest all the burdens and restrictions of the old. He tries to overlook that it is the first, and not the last day of the week; nay, if he become more solemn in his speech, through increased rigor of religious notions, he rejects the profane name of "Sunday," and studiously and emphatically styles it "*the* Sabbath." These two terms have become positively watchwords; a Catholic never uses the latter. Sunday sounds to his ears as a day of radiance and joy, as a day of smiles at home, and laughing peals of gladness in the air; as a day of cheerful service to Him who loves a cheerful giver, in canticles and hymns, and noble offices of prayer. But "Sabbath" rings with Puritanism in the ears, and gives the idea of drawling sounds and sour looks, of bitter theology and domestic gloom. There is no balmyness, no sweetness in the name. It belongs to a dispensation that is dead, and to obligations which the law of love has abated, or abolished. But singularly enough, that religious system which affects to put all its faith in Christ, and to loathe the Law and its works by a judicial blindness, clings to its very deadest branches, and tries to find there its most nutritious fruit. Having reduced all its practical worship to the compass of one day, it makes that a mere superstition; it condenses, only to corrupt.

What makes this strange infatuation still more amazing is, that in the New Testament it is so clearly attributed, as a characteristic, to the Pharisee. A simple-minded reader of the Gospel would naturally ask, who defended Sabbatarian strictness, our Lord, or His enemies? Who there represent the strait-laced party? It is impossible to hesitate in answering.

Not less than seven times in the Gospel history He lays down His doctrine of the Sabbath, in opposition to Pharisaical objections. Surely He must have considered this an important question of moral and ecclesiastical observance, so to expound it. But applying our often-repeated rule, we must conclude that, supposing our Redeemer to have never spoken besides on the subject, there was a particular reason for recording so many different inculcations of one idea. If, on the other hand, we maintain that He much oftener argued the point, we must still conclude that a strong motive led to so many repetitions of the same subject, in a record so limited as the Gospel. In other words, the selection of this topic seven times, in picking out the materials of that sacred history from a mass left behind, proves it to be one on which the spirit of God was pleased that we should accurately know the divine doctrine in the New Law. It shows an earnestness in guarding Christianity against a particular theory; and, we may safely conclude, against one sure to be taught. We must therefore take actual, not imaginary systems; and judge which among them our Saviour taught, and which he excluded. Without entering into the details of each case, we will analyze the evidence before us, and reduce it to distinct heads.

1. First, therefore, we will remark, that all the Gospels give more than one instance of attack upon our Lord for laxity on Sabbath observance. St. Matthew and St. Mark give two cases; St. Luke gives four, two being the same as those evangelists record; and St. John three perfectly distinct ones. This concurrence of the inspired writers on a secondary topic is very striking.

2. Of these cases, three directly accompany the performance of miracles, three are indirectly connected with miraculous works, and one relates to an ordinary occurrence.

3. We will proceed with the first class. A withered hand is cured in the synagogue.* This is done with previous attention called to the fact of its being the Sabbath day; the Pharisees put the question whether it be lawful to heal on that day; and Jesus first defends the propriety of doing it, and then confirms His assertion by the miraculous cure. A man sick with dropsy comes into the house of a Pharisee, where He is a guest. It is again the Sabbath, and His enemies "watch Him." He, this time, puts the very question to them which, on the former occasion, they had put to Him: "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath

---

* Matt. xii. 10; Mark iii. 2; Luke vi. 6.

day?" Again He argues the point, and performs a miracle to prove His doctrine.* A woman bowed down by an ailment of eighteen years' duration is in the synagogue on the Sabbath; she does not ask to be relieved; but Jesus calls her, and lays His blessed hands upon her, and she is made straight. "The ruler of the Synagogue" (being angry that Jesus had healed on the Sabbath) "answering, said to the multitude" (that is not liking to address our Lord, with whom, in reality, he was displeased, reproved Him through the people, saying), "Six days there are wherein ye ought to work, in these, therefore, come and be healed, and not on the Sabbath day."† Again our Lord replies, vindicating what He had done, and beginning His answer by the significant words: "Ye hypocrites!"

The next instance is also one in which the attack is first made through the subject of the miracle. Jesus cured a man at the pool of Bethsaida, saying to him: "Arise, take up thy bed and walk." He obeyed; "and it was the Sabbath that day." Immediately He was told, "It is the Sabbath, it is not lawful for thee to take up thy bed." Upon discovering that Jesus had given him the command, the Jews transfer their hatred to Him. "Therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, because He did these things on the Sabbath." And when He again defended Himself, saying, that as His Father worked until now, so He worked; that is, that as His Father, on the Sabbath, went on with His beneficent work of Providence, so did He, who had the same power; the Jews only redoubled their hatred. "Hereupon, therefore, the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He did not only break the Sabbath, but also said God was His Father, making Himself equal to God."*

---

* Luke xiv. 1.

† Ibid. xiii. 10.

After this discourse, our blessed Lord left Jerusalem, where it took place, and taught in Galilee. On His return to the holy city, he again resumed this subject, in the following singular terms: "One work I have done, and ye all wonder. Therefore Moses gave you circumcision—and on the Sabbath day you circumcise a man. If a man receive circumcision on the Sabbath day, that the law of Moses may not be broken, are you angry at me because I have healed the whole man on the Sabbath day?"† Now, no miracle has preceded this speech, in the Gospel narrative, and as we can hardly suppose the allusion to be made to the miracle wrought at a former visit, nor could that be called "one work," for many signs had been wrought between, we are naturally led to suppose that St. John, or rather the divine Spirit, considered the record of this instruction more important than that of the miracle. The latter was therefore omitted, and the former preserved.

Again the Pharisaical spirit is roused when Jesus performs one of the most severely tested of His miracles,—the cure of the man born blind.

---

* John v. 1.

† Ibid. vii. 22.

He might at once have restored his sight by a word or touch. He preferred performing the cure by what might be called a mechanical, or manual, labor. He made clay, and therewith anointed the man's eyes. "Now it was the Sabbath, when Jesus made clay, and opened his eyes." This is sufficient ground with the Pharisees for rejecting the miracle. "This man is not of God, who keepeth not the Sabbath."*

One more instance remains, wholly unconnected with any miraculous operation; yet three evangelists have recorded it. The incident is trifling, but its instruction very great. The apostles, going through a corn-field on the Sabbath, pluck the ripe ears, rub them in their hands, and eat the grains. This mechanical operation is construed by the Pharisees into a breach of the Law, and reproved as such. Our Redeemer defends His disciples in the same manner as He had defended Himself.† What gives particular interest to this case is that each evangelist who records it, proceeds immediately to the narrative of the cure of the withered hand, as though our Lord wrought this miracle expressly to confirm His vindication of the apostles.

4. From all these facts we conclude that in seven cases, two views of Sabbath observance were discussed between our Saviour and the Jews; and that in every one He represents and upholds the lenient and moderate side, they the intolerant and

---

* John ix. 14.

† Matt. xii. 1; Mark ii. 23; Luke vi. 1.

oppressive. Now a similar discrepancy exists at the present day between Catholics and Protestants, and there can be no doubt which party corresponds to each of the former disputants. It may be said that zeal for the Sabbath was carried to excess by the Jews, in every one of these instances, far beyond what the most infatuated Sabbatarian nowadays would require. We are not so sure of that. We need not go back to the days of wild, Puritanical fanaticism for instances of extreme rigor on this subject. We need not travel to old Banbury for the well-known enforcement on feline propensities of Sabbath observance, by making a solemn example of the cat that presumed to mouse on the Sunday. But we recollect not many years ago a case of death from starvation at a large town in the west of England, because the society from which relief was sought rigidly refused to grant it on the Lord's day. Still more recently a well-known instance was publicly quoted of a lady of high rank, who in vain implored conveyance by railway in Scotland, to pay the last offices of affection to a dying relation, though empty mail-trains passed to and fro. And we know that a similar refusal was made to a Catholic ecclesiastic of high dignity in the same country, when it was the only means of bearing the last rites of religion to a departing parishioner. Now, here is Sabbatical observance preferred to charity; in one instance, though death might be, and was, the consequence. This is carrying the principle to the full Pharisaic standard. "Come and be healed on week-days." In fact, what would any of the four who were purposely cured on the Sabbath have lost by waiting till next morning? After eighteen, and thirty-eight years' infirmity, one day more would not have been a heavy addition; the dropsical patient could still walk, and therefore could not be in any danger; and the withered hand could not be much needed on the Jewish Sabbath. Had our Lord said in these cases: "To-morrow come and I will heal you, for this is the Sabbath," He would have spoken words with which Exeter Hall would have rung, and given a text to be stereotyped by tract-dealers, and engraved for children's copies. But He says exactly the contrary always; and we find the upholders of the Sabbatical superstition, they who pretend to look to our Saviour for everything, carefully overlooking His teaching on the subject, suppressing His words and running to the law of fear, and its abolished rigors, nay to its exaggerated traditions among the Jews, for the pattern of their observance.

5. On the other hand, they tax papists, particularly on the Continent, with being habitual Sabbath-breakers. We condemn utterly every violation that is contrary to the laws of the Church; all traffic, public works, shop-keeping, and unnecessary business. But we reprove no less the other extreme which forms the Protestant principle. Rest was not meant to be idleness, and no Christain festival was intended to be gloomy. One cannot fail to

be struck by the strong language employed by our Redeemer, when He denounced the rule of Sabbath observance which our modern reformers have selected. "Ye hypocrites!" And the charge of this hateful vice is fully justified by what we read in passages referred to. The poor disciples pluck some ears of corn, "being hungry," and eat them. The Pharisees immediately cry out, "Behold Thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do on the Sabbath day."* And then we find that "when Jesus went into the house of one of the chief of the Pharisees *on the Sabbath day, to eat bread*, they watched Him."† Now, is not this exactly the case with our modern Sabbatarians? They always have one law of observance for the rich, and another for the poor. The one must not pluck an ear of corn on the Sabbath, without the rich man's reprehending him and then going home to his luxurious dinner with his friends. It used to be proposed to suppress all Sunday cooking in public bakeries, where alone the poor could have a warm meal prepared, on their only day of rest; but no Sir Andrew ever dreamt of shutting off the steam of the boiler, or putting a break on the smoke-jack, of aristocratic kitchens. There is something hypocritically profane in the spectacle described as taking place on Sunday at fashionable Scotch kirks, of some twenty carriages at the door, with their human appurtenances, waiting for devout listeners to a discourse against Sunday travelling!

---

* Matt. xi. 2.

† Luke xiv. 1

Nor have we ever heard that the eloquent Boanerges ever whispered a *wee* word of reproof to the gentlefolks for their zeal to lay the burdens of the law only on the already overburdened shoulders of the poor. Depend upon it he never called them "hypocrites," though that is Scripture.

6. However inconsistent was the Pharisee's theory of having a good dinner himself, while he was horrified at a hungry poor man's rubbing the wheat-ears in his hand, to eat them, our dear Lord, who looked to our instruction, did not hesitate to dine with him on that day. And He justified his conduct by the cure of the dropsical man, who possibly presented himself with the connivance of the host; for he, with his friends, were "watching" our Lord before the cure. He did not, however, despise Jewish prejudices merely to this extent. He braved hatred and persecution for His views and practice regarding the Sabbath. St. Luke tells us that the Scribes and Pharisees, on account of His healing on the Sabbath day, "were filled with madness, and they talked to one another what they might do to Jesus."* St. Matthew explains that this consultation was "how they might destroy Jesus."† St. John informs us that "therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, because He did these things on the Sabbath."‡ This contempt for the prejudices of the bigot Jews, this braving of their hatred and persecution, for the sake of

---

* Luke vi. 11. † Matt. xii. 14. ‡ John v. 16.

a principle on such a subject, at once stamps the view of those men with the note of reprobation and wickedness. One so meek as Jesus, who had come to "fulfil all justice," who asserted boldly, and with divine truth, that "not a jot nor tittle of the Law should pass away," who attended to every legal obligation, from His twelfth year to the eve of His death, who would "not bruise the broken reed, nor extinguish the smoking flax," so tender was His tread to be on earth; one, in fine, who was come to purchase the soul of the most cynical Pharisee at as dear a rate as that of His holy Mother, must have considered that an evil principle which He crushed so unmercifully seven times, and which to uproot he braved the fury and hatred of the dominant party in church and state. Hence the Catholic moralist well understands the term *scandalum pharisaicum* as opposed to the *scandalum pusillorum*,* the first of which may safely be despised; but the latter, never.

7. Finally, our Lord, whose example so clearly sustains the temperate and Christian views of the Catholic Church on this ritual question, lays down principles comformable to His practice, which form the basis of this Church's conduct. "The Son of Man is the Lord also of the Sabbath; the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." These two aphorisms contain the whole of our doctrine and of our discipline on the subject. He who declared Himself Lord of the Sabbath, also

---

* "Pharisaical scandal," "and scandal of Christ's little ones."

said to His apostles: "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth; as My Father hath sent me, so I also send you."* Within the compass of this delegated power came the Sabbath; and the Catholic at once acquiesces in the transfer of its obligations, by the apostles, to the Sunday. And if the Sabbath was made to serve man, whereas man was not created to be the slave of the Sabbath,—man's true interests are to be the standard, whereby the Church will ever regulate her precepts respecting it. Moroseness and debauchery are equally alien from her thoughts; nor could the spouse of Christ have devised a mode of spending it, which makes its morning dull, and its evening dissipated. It could not have crammed into it the spiritual duties of the six other days, and so made it an iron yoke. It could not have sanctified it, by excluding from it the performance of even charitable works. It could not have consecrated it to stupidity and sloth, by withdrawing from it all innocent recreation and refreshing cheerfulness. All this would not have been considering or treating the Sabbath as made for man. This can only be the case where it promotes his happiness; where it instructs his mind, applies rightly his intellect, tones his feelings, by a gentle sway, to wholesome kindliness, raises his thoughts by a noble and beautiful worship, improves his social and domestic relations by a more virtuous intercourse, invigorates his frame by seasonable repose, mingled with temperate recreation; and, in fine, makes him live one day of every seven of his life under the chastening discipline of religion, but still more under the sweet influence of God's countenance, felt to be more present, more benign, more radiant than on other days, with an eye more watchful indeed over evil, but more open to our better deeds. This is the Lord's Day of the New Law; this is the Sunday on which the glory of the spiritual firmament reigns supreme.

---

* Matt. xxviii. 18; John xx. 21.

V. We opened our essay with the transactions of our blessed Saviour's infancy, and we will close it with the last actions of His life. We promise to be very concise.

Here, as in the noblest tragedy, action becomes equivalent to suffering, and our Redeemer may be said to do for man, whatever man does against Him. Now, to our minds, there is nothing more decisive of the respective claims of Catholic and Protestant to be the religion of the New Testament, than the manner in which they treat its most solemn portion, that which records the final act of redemption. The very essence of modern Protestantism is, to regard this greatest act as a mere abstraction. The mind is concentrated on the sole apprehension of an accomplished atonement, and its instrumentality by death. By a process eminently selfish, the price and its purchase are transferred to the individual soul, appropriated by it, and thus viewed extraneously to Him whose they really are. There is no contemplation in the Protestant view; it is one of mere self-application. To contrast it with the Catholic idea, and so illustrate both, perhaps a simple parable may be useful.

Let us imagine to ourselves two spendthrifts, for whose debts a loving father has given bond. The day of reckoning arrives and the surety comes willingly to pay the ransom. One son stands by, grateful indeed, but cold and calculating. He looks not at the huge sum that is counted out, but is eagerly waiting for the last coin to be told and then exultingly cries out, "I am free;" and goes his way. But there is another beside him, who watches with the intensest gaze every particle of the precious offering, because he knows what it has cost his father to procure it. In every piece he recognizes the fruit of some privation undergone or some cruel humiliation endured. On one he reads his father's hunger, another his abject toil. He remembers, as one portion of the store is brought out, that it was gained at the expense of calumny and hatred from friends; and when another is produced, that it was earned by the loss of those most dear to him. At every instalment he looks into his dear, parent's countenance, and sees its manly sorrow and its varying emotions, as these same recollections pass over his heart; and though the smile of love is on his lips, as the last golden drachma falls from his hand, at thought of what he has achieved for his children, even this is but more heartrending to the tender one of the two; and he almost loses all sense of his own liberation in the anguish inflicted by its price. He thinks not of himself, for love is not selfish. He goes not away singing, "I am ransomed, I am free," but he rushes to his father's feet, exclaiming, "Thou hast purchased me, I am thine!"

Such we believe to be the true difference between the Protestant and the Catholic mode of considering our Saviour's passion. The one looks at it with an acquisitive eye; the other with the eye of love. To the Protestant it would have been the same if the simple act of death had been recorded, and its preliminary and accompanying sufferings had been suppressed. Not one emotion would have been lost to him, any more than, in his system, any advantage. What does the cruel agony in Gethsemane give him? It does not redeem him. What does he gain by the welts and gashes of the Roman scourges. They do not ransom him. What profits him the mock coronation, and its insulting homage? It does not save him. And then what can Mary and John do for him at the cross' foot? He declares she does not care for them. What matters it to him if the seamless garment be diced for, or rent? It bears no deep mystery of faith to him. No; only let him secure that moment when the last breath passes over the Victim's lips, and it is enough—for it is the atonement.

Yet all that we have briefly enumerated was suffered for our sakes, and recorded for our profit. Although the last piece completed our ransom, all that preceded it composed the sum. For surely our Divine Redeemer did nought in vain, nor aught superfluously. He was generous, indeed, but not wasteful. The Catholic, therefore, treasures up in his heart every smallest gift of love, where the smallest is immense. From this minuteness of Catholic perception springs a sense of reality, an approximation of feeling, which makes that not merely vivid, but present, which is separated from us by ages. On the other side is a mere hazy and vague generality, merging in a conception of the mind, instead of a real fact. And from this unreality easily springs up a lurking infidelity, that saps the foundation of Christianity. The mind comes to think it unnecessary to trouble itself about details, so long as the one apprehended truth is certain. "Christ died for us, no matter how," is the whole needful dogma of an evangelical mind.

But there is another view from which the Protestant eye habitually shrinks, but one which the Catholic boldly contemplates; it is that which completes the circle, by joining the beginning and the end of the Gospel together, steadily uniting the incarnation and the death. The first of these great mysteries receives but little prominence in modern Protestantism, because this lacks the daring of faith, to believe that He who died was the Word incarnate. And it is this feebleness of belief that leads to that vagueness and generalization in doctrine which we have described. Say to a Protestant, "God was struck in the face; God was scourged;

God was crowned with thorns;" and he dares not trust himself to look upon the doctrine. The eagle eye that can gaze upon the sun belongs not to his system; it is but a craven bird. He feels himself unable to grasp the awful mystery. If he deny the divinity of our Lord, his atonement is gone. But he dares not contemplate the dogma through its various applications, and he shrinks from such phrases as we have given with a misgiving terror. They sound shocking and almost profane. And thus he is driven to suppress in his thoughts those detailed sequels of the incarnation, and dwell upon only obscure perceptions of two doctrines, which he has not heart to firmly combine. Socinianism thus becomes the refuge of a vacillating attempt at faith.

The Catholic Church is a stranger to this wavering. She pursues one doctrine through all the mazes of the other, and combines the two inextricably. The Infant and the Victim are equal realities; nay, a unity, beginning in God and in God ending; God throughout, in feebleness as in might, in obscurity and in brightness, in suffering and in glory. Nothing in Him is little, nothing unworthy; the fool's garment on Him is as sacred as the snow bright vesture of Thabor; the scourge of cords in His uplifted hand is as mighty as the thunderbolt; the first lisping of His infant tongue as wisdomful as His Sermon on the Mount, a bruise upon His flesh as beautiful to angels' eyes, as adorable to man's soul, as His first smiling radiance shed upon

His virgin mother. Thus does the Church believe, thus realize her faith. She alone understands the true doctrine of her Saviour's death, as He Himself expounded it; for none other has learnt this lesson from His actions—that love is an essential condition of forgiveness as well as faith, and love it is that will linger over every detail of love.

END OF VOL. I.

8945

208.9
W 755 WISEMAN, CARD.

AUTHOR
Essays On Various Subjects I

TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	ROOM NUMBER
	~~STORAGE - CGPL~~	
2-27-85	Clgd Storage	
OCT 17 1985	T. Eden G.T.U 14663	
	RENEWED	
JAN 6 1986		
	RENEWED	
JUN 6 1986		
SEP 15 1986	RENEWED DEC 1 [illegible]	

208.9
W 755

8945